

Binding

The Department of State

bulletin

Vol. XXVI, No. 675

June 2, 1953

A STRONG DEFENSE TO ACHIEVE PEACE • Address
by the President 847

THE VOICE OF AMERICA AT THE WATER'S EDGE •
by Wilson Compton 864

SOME FOREIGN POLICY CROSSROADS • by Francis
H. Russell 859

U.S. DENIES HOLDING "CARTEL" POSITION ON
ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL • Statement by
Ambassador Cohen 872

GERMANY: TODAY AND TOMORROW (Part II) • by
Henry J. Kellermann 851



For index see back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXVI, No. 675 • PUBLICATION 4610

June 2, 1952

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

A Strong Defense To Achieve Peace

Address by the President¹

It is a real pleasure for me to be here today and to join in celebrating the establishment of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point 150 years ago.

This Academy was started during Thomas Jefferson's first term as President. The United States at that time was relatively small and weak and surrounded by dangers. We had just fought a limited and undeclared war with France to protect the freedom of our commerce and shipping. We were engaged in fighting another limited and undeclared war with the Barbary pirates for the same purpose.

Jefferson, like Washington and Hamilton and other leaders of our young Republic, knew very well that a strong military establishment was vital to the preservation of American liberty. And these patriot leaders knew also that you cannot have effective military forces unless you have well-trained, well-prepared officers. They all knew how Washington had to struggle and experiment all through the Revolution to find officers who could take troops into battle and lead them to victory. That was why they wanted a military academy, as an essential part of a strong, permanent national defense organization.

But there was a great deal of opposition to starting a military academy in this country. It took 20 years of argument and persuasion after the Revolution was over before the Academy could be started. And it was finally started largely because Jefferson took the position that if the Congress didn't authorize a military academy, he would set one up himself.

The argument over establishing a military academy was part and parcel of the argument over whether the United States should have strong

national defenses. That argument has continued, of course, right down to the present day, and much of the debate after the Revolution has a very modern sound.

There were a lot of people in this country in 1800 who were afraid that setting up a military academy and an army and navy would make us belligerent and warlike. You can hear echoes of that point of view today in the debate over universal military training.

There were a lot of other people in 1800 who said that a strong national defense would cost too much; that we couldn't afford it; and we ought to find some magic formula for achieving security without having to pay for it. That point of view is not only echoed today—it is loudly shouted in the newspapers and the halls of Congress.

Fortunately, those arguments did not prevail against the hard-headed common sense of men like Jefferson. The Military Academy was set up; and this country has had occasion to be thankful many times since then that our early leaders had so much foresight.

Toward a World of Law and Order

The Military Academy has repaid this country many times over for every cent it has cost. We have learned from experience that, while it may be expensive to maintain a strong national defense, it is much more expensive not to have one. Time and again, we have allowed our Armed Forces to dwindle down to a fraction of what they should have been, and then we have had to pay enormously—in money and in lives—because of our lack of preparedness. And there are people right now who want us to relax and cut down on our defense program. They are just as wrong as they can be. We have got to pay the cost of preventing

¹ Made before the sesquicentennial convocation at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., on May 20 and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

a world war—or we will surely have to pay the immensely greater cost of fighting one.

The other fear of the early opponents of the Military Academy has also proved groundless. Our country has never become warlike or aggressive.

This is partly because our Constitution nailed down so firmly the principle of civilian control over the military. The most important means by which this was done was by providing in the Constitution that the President, who is the civilian head of the Government elected by the people, shall be the commander in chief of all the military forces. Many Presidents, including the present one, have demonstrated that those words in the Constitution mean what they say.

But, in addition to this, the spirit of our people has never been warlike. Our people came to this country to find peace and freedom. That is what we have always wanted. That is what we want now, and that is what our national policy is designed to preserve.

But there is a vast difference between being peaceful and being passive. We want to achieve peace. But we know we can't have it unless we are willing to stand up for our rights.

We know we can't have lasting peace unless we work actively and vigorously to bring about conditions of freedom and justice in the world. That is what we are trying to do. And we are having to do it in the face of a concerted campaign of threats and sabotage and outright aggression directed by the Soviet Union.

The policies of the Soviet Union are exactly the opposite of our own. We want to establish equality and justice and the rule of law among all nations. They want to establish domination and dictatorship and the rule of force over all countries. This makes our situation—the situation of all free nations—difficult and dangerous in the extreme. But I am firmly convinced that it does not necessarily mean world war.

The free countries can, by proper and adequate defense measures, make clear to the Kremlin that aggression would be doomed to failure.

And the free nations can, by economic and political means, build up their strength so as to be safe from Communist infiltration and subversion.

But strong and active as we may be, we cannot avoid risks and sacrifices. They are inherent in the situation and we cannot wish them out of existence. The course of events is not completely in our own control.

Events in Korea Leading to Negotiations

In Korea, we had no choice but to meet armed aggression with military force. If we had not met aggression head on, the U.N. Charter would have been reduced to a scrap of paper. If Communist aggression had been allowed to succeed in

Korea, the Communist conquest of all Asia would have been simply a matter of time. If the United Nations had failed, and Asia had fallen, we would have been well on the way to a disintegration of freedom in the whole world.

But that did not happen. The valor and sacrifice of U.S. fighting men—together with the forces of the Republic of Korea and contingents from 15 other countries—has beaten the aggressors back within their own territory. Our Army, led in large part by men trained here at West Point, has done a superb job. From the time our men were first sent into action in the gallant rear guard defense down to the Pusan perimeter—from then right up to the present time, the U.S. Army in Korea has been magnificent. And the men who have fought with them, from the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and from the armed forces of other free countries, have been just as brave and effective.

Last June, 11 months ago, the badly battered Communists offered to confer about a military armistice in Korea. We were willing to conclude such an armistice. We still are. We don't want any more fighting than is absolutely necessary. But we were not interested, and we are not interested now, in any armistice that involves selling out the principles we are fighting for.

Patiently and skillfully, General Ridgway and his negotiating team, headed by Admiral Joy, have worked to bring about an effective armistice. They have done a masterful job in the face of great provocation. They have met threats, and abuse, and outright lies, all with great self-control and an unyielding insistence on the essentials of a just and honorable armistice.

Gradually, the Communists have come to realize that we will not sacrifice our principles to obtain an armistice. We do not know whether they will finally agree on an honest and workable armistice. So far, they have agreed to some of the points that must be covered. They have agreed that the armistice line across Korea should be a defensible military line determined by the location of the opposing forces. They have agreed that no reinforcements shall be brought into Korea by either side during the armistice. They have agreed that an inspection commission shall observe the carrying out of the armistice terms—and are apparently willing to withdraw their request that the Soviet Union should be one of the inspecting nations.

Up to now, however, the Communists have not agreed on a fair and proper exchange of prisoners of war. The Communists have continued to insist that all the prisoners we have taken must be handed over to them—regardless of whether or not they are willing to be sent back behind the Iron Curtain, and regardless of what their fate would be if they were sent back.

It is perfectly clear that thousands and thousands of the prisoners we hold would violently resist being returned to the Communists because

they fear the slavery or death which would await them. It would be a betrayal of the ideals of freedom and justice for which we are fighting if we forced these men at bayonet point to return to their ex-masters. We won't do it. We won't buy an armistice by trafficking in human slavery.

We do not know whether the Communists will accept this position. We may not know for some time yet. Negotiations are continuing under General Clark's direction. We shall remain ready to reach honorable settlements by peaceful means. But we must also be alert and ready to meet treachery or a renewal of aggression if that should come.

During these months of armistice negotiations in Korea, the Communists have increased their military strength. They have more men there than they had a year ago, and many more tanks and planes.

But we have consolidated and increased our strength in Korea also. The morale of our men is high, and our units are well-trained, well-equipped and at a peak of combat efficiency. The troops of the Republic of Korea are far better trained and equipped than they were a year ago, and are capable of carrying a much larger share of the defense of their country.

The situation in Korea is still difficult and uncertain. Everybody should understand that. But everyone should also understand that the sacrifices of the U.N. Forces in Korea have brought tremendous gains toward a world of law and order.

The plain fact is that the Communists have utterly failed in their objectives in Korea.

The Communist aggression failed to shatter the United Nations. Instead, the Communist attack has made the United Nations stronger and more vigorous and has demonstrated that it can and will act to defend freedom in the world.

The Communists failed to win a cheap and easy victory in Korea. Instead, they have suffered more than a million casualties, have used up enormous amounts of war material—and they are back behind the line they started from.

The Communists failed to establish tyranny over the Republic of Korea. Instead, the Communist aggression has brought devastation to North Korea—a terrible warning to the other satellites in the Soviet Empire of the cost of aggression.

Furthermore, the Communists failed to break the will of free men in other countries. The attack on Korea was supposed to warn other countries that they had better yield to the demands of the Kremlin—or else. The Communist aggression did show the world that the Kremlin was ready and willing to try to extend its power by military conquest. But the effect of this was not to send the free countries into a panic of fear. Instead, they immediately stepped up their plans for building military forces, and began to get

together on concrete and definite defense arrangements.

As a result of Korea, the Kremlin knows that free men will stand up and fight against aggression. As a result of Korea, free men around the world know that if they stand up for what is right, they will not be deserted by the United Nations. And, as a result of Korea, the free countries are infinitely better prepared to defend themselves than they were 2 years ago.

Improvement in Defense Production

Our own defense production has risen very sharply. Our production of military supplies and equipment is more than three times what it was a year ago. For example, in January 1952, six times the dollar value of ammunition was delivered as was delivered in January 1951. In electronics and communication equipment, five times as much was delivered.

The production of one of our most important fighter planes was four times as much this spring as it was last spring. We now have several thousand tanks of a new model which is very much better than previous models. Our Navy has taken hundreds of ships out of mothballs and has a sound shipbuilding program under way.

An atomic artillery piece has been developed and tested and will have to be reckoned with in the future. The Navy is working on its first atomic powered submarine. Our over-all atomic production program is in excellent shape.

In all the vast and complicated field of combat vehicles and military weapons, the research and preparation of the last several years are paying off. The goods are being delivered to the hands of men who are ready to use them in defense of freedom—both in our own forces and among the many trusted friends that we have all over the world.

The improvement in defense production is not the only indication of an improved situation in the world.

Progress in World Defense System

In the Far East, Japan has rejoined the family of free and democratic nations. The Communist insurrection in the Philippines has been brought under control. In Indochina, the forces of France and the Associated States have succeeded in holding the Communists in check. The people of Indochina are making progress in the creation of national armies to defend their own independence. Countries like India and Pakistan and Indonesia are making real headway in creating the conditions of economic growth that must underlie solid and stable progress.

In Europe, great steps toward unity are being taken. The Schuman Plan and plans for the European Defense Community are moving for-

ward. We are working to reach final agreement on a new relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany. This will make it possible for Germany to take her place alongside the other independent countries of Europe as a full and equal member of the community of nations.

These are very remarkable developments. Countries like France, Germany, and Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, with centuries of rivalry behind them, are now starting to work together. They are developing common economic and political institutions, and they are merging their military forces into one great defensive system.

No wonder the Soviets are trying to block this advance. No wonder the current Communist propaganda line is trying to persuade the countries of Western Europe that they should stay separate and weak, instead of joining together for strength. The Kremlin knows as well as anyone else that in union there is strength—and that a united Europe can frustrate the Kremlin's dearest wish of absorbing the European countries one by one into the Soviet Empire.

I don't think the people of Europe are going to be fooled by this Soviet propaganda. I believe the firm and concrete steps the Europeans have already taken, over the opposition of the Kremlin, are clear indications that they are not going to be stopped now. I think the Europeans are going to continue to move toward closer union—for they know that is the way of strength and progress for them and for the whole free world.

I have been speaking of the progress that is being made. But I don't want anyone to get the impression that there is any basis for relaxing or letting up. These signs of progress are not evidence that the battle for freedom is won—only that we are on the way to winning it. If we halt or falter now, we could ruin the whole structure of peace and freedom we have been so painfully building.

I have warned the Congress, on several occasions, that the financial support I have requested for our own defense effort and for the Mutual Security Program is absolutely necessary. Any substantial cuts in those items would have extremely serious effects. No one enjoys bearing the heavy costs of national security in these dangerous times, but we should never forget how much smaller they are than the costs of another world war.

Alert To Avert Another World War

No one should assume that the possibility of world war has become remote. The forces of the Soviet Empire are large, well-trained, and equipped with modern weapons including the atom bomb. The Kremlin's desire to dominate the world is obviously unchanged.

But I believe we are well on the way to preserving our freedom without paying the frightful cost

of world war. We are on the right track. We must go ahead.

If we are to succeed, we must have steady nerves and stout hearts. There is no easy way out, no quick solution. But we have with us the overwhelming support of the free countries, and the powerful moral forces of liberty and justice. We are using the strength God has given us in this great and wonderful Nation to win the struggle for peace and freedom throughout the world.

You young men here at West Point are called on to play a great part in the tremendous effort we are making. You are being trained for a career which, in these times especially, means service for the great good of your Nation and the welfare of mankind. Your opportunities are great because the task ahead of you is great.

We need—all of us—to draw on the wonderful tradition of resolution and courage which has been cherished for 150 years in the life of the cadets here at West Point.

President Urges Funds for U.S. Participation in Olympics

A PROCLAMATION¹

WHEREAS, by a joint resolution approved this day, the Congress has noted that "the XVth Olympic Games of the modern era will be held at Helsinki, Finland, from July 19 through August 3, 1952" and that "experiences afforded by the Olympic Games make a unique contribution to common understanding and mutual respect among all peoples"; and

WHEREAS the joint resolution declares further that "the United States Olympic Association, an organization not for pecuniary profit or gain, its activities being wholly supported by the public, is now making an appeal for the sum of \$850,000, necessary to equip, transport, feed, house, and present in competition over four hundred amateur athletes from all classes of our society and all parts of our country to represent the United States in the 1952 Olympic Games"; and

WHEREAS the joint resolution accordingly authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation "designating the seven-day period beginning May 18, 1952, as Olympic Week and urging all citizens of our country to contribute as generously as possible to insure that the United States will be fully and adequately represented in the XVth Olympic Games";

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the seven days beginning Sunday, May 18, 1952, as Olympic Week, and I urge our people to respond with generosity to the appeal of the United States Olympic Association for funds with which to defray the expenses incident to the participation of our athletes in this classic international competition.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this sixteenth day of May in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-two, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-sixth.

[SEAL]

HARRY S. TRUMAN

¹ No. 2976 (17 Fed. Reg. 4607).

Germany: Today and Tomorrow

PART II

by Henry J. Kellermann

John J. McCloy approached his responsibilities as U.S. High Commissioner for Germany with statesmanship and vision. In carrying out this Government's directive for introducing democracy to Germany, he applied four basic principles:

First, democracy is a way of life, not just another governmental system. In the earlier days of the Occupation, democracy had been taught from the top down. From now on, it would also have to be built up from the grass roots. This meant, first of all, that democracy had to start at home: in the family, in the community council, in the town meeting. It also meant that it had to start with the young: in the kindergarten, in the school, in child-guidance clinics, and in youth organizations.

Second, democracy is a cooperative exercise; it requires the responsible participation of *all* citizens. Until 1949 democracy in Germany had been often suspected as an American "hand-me-down." Now, the German people were needed to bring their dreams, their skills, and their labor to bear on the development of a system that they could proudly call their own. According to the Long-Range Policy Statement of 1946,¹ "The reconstruction of the cultural life of Germany must be in large measure the work of the Germans themselves. . . ." Unless German participation was enlisted, the democratic institutions set up in earlier days might not withstand the first waves of reaction which were bound to come.

¹ *Germany 1947-1949*, p. 541.

This article is based on an address which Mr. Kellermann, Director of the Office of German Public Affairs, made at Philadelphia on May 5 before the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, which this year observes the centennial of Carl Schurz' arrival in the United States from Germany in 1852. Schurz subsequently served as U.S. Minister to Spain, as a general in the Union Army, as U.S. Senator from Missouri, and as Secretary of the Interior under President Hayes.

Part I of the article appeared in the *Bulletin* of May 26, p. 807.

Third, democracy must have native partisans. Some of our early emissaries to Germany had started their mission on the premise that Germany was an ideological wilderness and that every citizen was a potential convert. They overlooked the fact that Germany had known democracy before, although it was true that democracy in Germany had been the tradition of a minority which went down in defeat. But nonetheless, Germany had had her Ferdinand Freiligrath, her Rudolph Virchow, her Hugo Preuss, and her Carl Schurz. It was their tragedy not merely that they were disowned by their fellow citizens but that they never found the support of fellow democrats outside Germany. Again I find myself in complete agreement with George Kennan who, in his book *American Diplomacy*, points out with irresistible logic that one of our basic mistakes *vis-à-vis* Germany was perhaps not so much our reluctance to

resist nazism more energetically once it had achieved supremacy, but our indolence in face of conditions which made Hitler's rise possible. Had we in the 1920's given more encouragement and support, both moral and material, to those forces in Germany on whose existence and influence depended the growth and the very life of democracy, history might have taken a different turn. Consequently, our policy of reconstruction in Germany, in order to be enduring, had to have focus as well as vision. Strategy, as well as economy, demanded that our efforts be well aimed and designed to help specifically those groups, organizations, and institutions which had demonstrated their devotion to democratic ideals and practices and to the common cause of the Western democracies.

Fourth, democracy is not secured without sacrifice. This Nation has always been ready in the hour of need to shield its freedom with the lives of its citizens. It would have seemed paradoxical in the extreme if history should record that in Germany we had been willing to sacrifice human blood in defense of democracy but had been reluctant to spend dollars to make certain that this sacrifice would not be in vain. The task of insuring our victory in Germany required charity, daring, imagination, and a sense of historical perspective. Our effort had to be big, not niggardly.

"The Long Arm of U.S. Policy"

The job was assigned to Hrcog's Office of Public Affairs. Public affairs, until then, had involved a multitude of scattered activities, including the information program with its radio, press, and motion-picture branches, and the education and exchange program. It now became "the long arm of U.S. policy in Germany." The program was enlarged to more than double the size contemplated by Military Government; in many respects it was tripled and quadrupled. The budget for the fiscal year 1950 was raised to 15½ million dollars and more than 100 million deutschemarks.

The number of exchangees proposed by Military Government for 1949 had totaled 300 students and 199 leaders and specialists; the High Commissioner increased the number to 722 students and 1,966 leaders and specialists. What is more important, the selection of these exchangees was refined to give maximum attention to categories considered vital in the light of our policy objectives. The staff of the Office of Public Affairs

was strengthened numerically, through the inclusion of close to 200 resident officers who were to carry the message of the program to the remotest hamlet, as well as qualitatively, through the recruitment of outstanding American citizens in many walks of life who, in view of their past experience at strategic posts, could be expected to make a real contribution to the program. What is still more important, the number of the regular staff was increased by experts and specialists from all over the United States who went to Germany to assist the High Commissioner and the Germans with the solution of urgent problems in many fields of civic activities. In addition, hundreds of schools, colleges, and public and private agencies, and thousands of individuals in the United States have offered to Germans hospitality, training, and advice. Many volunteers have gone to Germany to supplement the efforts of the Government.

As a result, the Public Affairs Program has become one of the greatest citizens' cooperatives ever organized in the field of international relations, and at the same time one of the most rewarding experiments in human relations.

We have not always had a perfect score. There were no precedents to guide us in setting up this unique program; much had to be done by trial and error. As we move into the fourth year of operation, we are still at the experimental stage in some respects, and we are refining our approaches in others. Yet some achievements stand out in bold relief. Outstanding among these is the exchange program which has brought to the United States more than 6,000 Germans, including Government officials, teachers, journalists, labor leaders, specialists of all kinds, but above all youth. By October 1951, 1,050 teen-agers, 1,250 university students, 775 trainees, and 375 youth leaders had come to the United States. Their experiences in the United States will, we hope, help insure peace and friendship between the coming generations of our two countries.

Our information centers and branches, with their libraries, discussion groups, public forums, and exhibits, have become known as "the windows to the West" and welcome more than 1 million visitors each month. Our workshops for youth leaders have been attended by 30,000 young people to date. With the help of American experts, 200 new textbooks have been written and distributed in 43 million copies.

One of the most important experiments has been the so-called Special Projects Program, also known as the "McCloy Fund," which is a unique plan designed to help Germans help themselves. Essentially, its purpose is to stimulate German interest in and contribution to the establishment of institutions which will further the growth of democratic processes in Germany. It has been a medium of true American-German partnership on behalf of common objectives. To date, 473 projects, including the construction and furnishing of institutions in the fields of education, community organization, youth activities, public health, and welfare, have been financed out of these funds; the High Commissioner has allocated roughly 53½ million deutschemarks which have been matched by a German contribution of 50 million deutschemarks. In addition, grants-in-aid have been given to needy and deserving institutions which are considered vital for purposes of political and cultural reorientation.

Supplementing these long-range activities are information programs designed to acquaint the German people with developments of national and international importance and to explain U.S. policies. These operations include our radio station RIAS in Berlin, our newspaper *Die Neue Zeitung*, our news service *Amerika Dienst*, our magazine *Der Monat*, and our film, book, and pamphlet program.

Measuring the Result

What has been the result of these efforts?

Let us remember that in our attempts to help bring about certain changes in German society, we have been dealing with an extremely delicate object: the human mind. It would be naive to expect that whatever therapy we devised could have an effect overnight or even within a few years. Final results may not become evident within the lifetime of our generation. Yet there are indications that our labor has not been wasted. Some are entirely intangible, others are more concrete.

First of all, then, is the Public Affairs Program itself appreciated by Germans? The answer must be an unqualified "yes." During a recent debate in the Bundestag, for instance, speakers for all major parties praised the exchange program as one of the most constructive and progressive projects the United States has ever undertaken in Germany. They pointed out that the program has

proved to be "an effective way gradually to transform the unproductive relationship of victor and vanquished into a partnership of equality." I had the great personal satisfaction, in a private session with some of the most prominent leaders of all major parties, to see this appreciation extended to all major areas of the program and to hear German leaders ask for a continuation and, if possible, an expansion of at least some of the activities in the years to come.

When Germans recently heard of impending moves to close some of our information centers, we received letters of protest from Germans of all walks of life imploring us to maintain these institutions which had served "as a bridge of understanding between our countries" and were "never more desperately needed than now." One writer said:

Military superiority is, alas, an absolute necessity with things being what they are today. But any number of divisions would be standing in empty space, were they not backed by sufficient moral resistance. In order to maintain and strengthen that resistance . . . the America Houses should be maintained as one of the most important contributing factors.

On February 22, 1952, a new information center opened at Essen. Minister President Arnold of North Rhine Westphalia, one of the main speakers, exemplifies the intelligent European's growing understanding of American culture and of America's role in world affairs. In the course of his address he said:

I should like to express the thanks of the Land North-Rhine Westphalia for the generous gift of the American people and to extend greetings to a nation which in recent years has proved that no sacrifice is too great in the cause of freedom all over the world.

Apart from its more tangible effects, the Public Affairs Program undoubtedly has fostered German understanding of the United States and has cleared away many of the misconceptions and suspicions inherited from the days of Nazi propaganda; it has also remedied prejudices due to plain ignorance. Above all, it has contributed immeasurably to the improvement of German-American relations.

Evidence of good feelings between Germans and Americans is increasing steadily—a trend confirmed by public-opinion surveys. When Germans were asked whether they felt relations between the German people and the Occupation Powers had deteriorated, in view of recent critical statements in the press, an insignificant minority responded in the affirmative; the vast majority said, "No." In fact, more than a fourth of the

respondents in all of Western Germany and more than a third in the U.S. zone felt that relations had improved. An even greater proportion claimed that relations between the German Government and the Occupying Powers are better today than ever before. Fifty-five percent of all people in Western Germany and 60 percent in the U.S. zone knew the name of the U.S. High Commissioner, and of those Germans who knew his position, two-thirds asserted that his administration had benefitted Western Germany.

Views on European Union

More significant are results of surveys which show German response to some of the policies advocated by the Western Allies in Germany, specifically to the integration of Germany into the community of democratic nations in Europe. It appears that this policy, more than any other, has found its mark and has kindled, above all among the young, genuine enthusiasm for international cooperation. In a recent poll, 7 out of 10 persons in Western Germany agreed that European union is a good idea; moreover, about half of the respondents declared that they would approve the transfer of basic national rights to a proposed government of the United States of Europe, were it to be established; finally, one-third of these people felt that Germany should join the "United States of Europe" at once—that is, not wait until Germany is reunited.

Those are some of the intangible results of our efforts. Others are more concrete. Above all, there is today in Germany a ground swell of interest in civic affairs never witnessed heretofore. It is manifest not only in the existence of an alert democratic press and radio, but also in the growing number of citizens' groups concerned with international and particularly inter-European relations, with human and civil rights, with inter-faith relations, with public education, with welfare, with mental health, and with community betterment. Some of these efforts are reflected in the establishment of permanent institutions under German, binational, and multinational auspices, such as neighborhood houses, youth centers, child-guidance clinics, and Nation-wide associations concerned with various aspects of civic endeavor. Plans are on foot for a national conference on human rights this fall, the first of its kind in Germany, which may prove one of the

most important manifestations of democratic thinking in Germany.

In the field of education, progress has been made toward equalization of educational opportunities, for instance through free tuition and free textbooks in several Laender. The period of the common school program is being extended to reduce the ill effects of Germany's traditional school organization, which generally denied students of low-income groups the educational opportunities offered children of well-to-do families. Standards of requirements for teacher training have been raised; modern school buildings and furnishings have replaced some of the dusty dungeons of earlier days; schools are being used increasingly for community services; more emphasis is being placed on civic education; teacher organizations are springing up everywhere.

Some changes have been made in the field of higher education, but they are not quite so conspicuous or numerous as in other areas. A fine example of militant academic freedom has been set by the institutions of higher learning in Berlin, above all by the Free University; the Institute of Social Research has been reestablished at Frankfurt, and an Institute for Educational Research created; American Institutes have been founded at several German universities. One of the most remarkable developments has been the election of two American citizens of German descent to serve as presidents of two German universities—an unprecedented step in German academic history.

This, then, is the Germany of today—a country hard on the border which separates freedom from servitude; a country which itself is half-free and half-slave; a country which today is occupied, divided, and with unsettled status.

Germany's Future

What will Germany be tomorrow? Will she be free, unified, and integrated with the rest of the free world? We shall do well to remember that freedom, reunification, and integration on German terms have been the very motives of two holocausts in recent history. Will history repeat itself once more? Will Germany again renounce her common heritage with the West, disown her Carl Schurz, and fight against her kin? Or will Germany join the free nations of the West and throw her support to the cause of democracy?

Those who have followed developments in Germany closely over the past 3 years know that in

principle Germany's decision has been made. Spokesmen for the Government and representatives of the opposition have declared firmly that Germany is part of the West by history, culture, and basic beliefs. The German Bundestag has ratified the Schuman Plan by a substantial majority; it has approved in principle German participation in the European Defense Community.

These are encouraging developments. It is reassuring to know that agreement exists between us and Germany on the principles which are to guide our future union. It attests to the foresight and good will of the German Government and its legislature that both have gone on record with a public endorsement of these principles. But let us be quite frank about it: professions of unity are not enough unless they lead to conclusive action. The time for such action is now.

The position of the U.S. Government and of its Western Allies is unequivocal and specific. We welcome the return of a free and democratic Germany to full membership in the community of Western nations; we favor close integration of Germany with the European defense effort; and we desire Germany's participation in those political and economic arrangements which are designed to insure the unity of the European nations and the freedom and welfare of their citizens.⁸

The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have given formal expression to their wish to see Germany take her empty chair in the council of nations. The contractual agreements with the Government of the Federal Republic will in effect restore to it full authority over external and internal affairs. Those restrictions which will be retained are not intended to discriminate against Germany or to reflect on her eligibility for full sovereignty in principle. They result chiefly from the fact that Germany is divided and that, as we know, Eastern Germany is under the political and military control of a power which has used aggression and threats of aggression as instruments of foreign policy. The Federal Republic does not have the power to withstand such pressure without the support of the Western Powers.

Nothing would please us more than to extend the benefits of a full and lasting peace treaty to

all Germans, including those smarting under Communist control. The efforts of this Government over the last 7 years have been aimed at a fair and realistic settlement of all problems blocking the way to German unification and peace. We have not succeeded, because of the intransigence of the fourth of the powers. Under the circumstances, we shall have to be satisfied, at least for the time being, with an arrangement which will extend the borders of peace as far east as possible, hoping for the day when the rest of Germany will be free to join through peaceful orderly democratic processes.

In the meantime, the contractual agreements will afford the Federal Republic of Germany the status of equality which she desires and needs to discharge the responsibilities of partnership in the Western World. With the attainment of this status, the Federal Republic will assume the rights and obligations which fall upon any member of this community, including the obligation of defending the European commonwealth against any act of aggression. This is the substance of a special agreement between Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

With the conclusion of these agreements, the period of Occupation of Germany comes to an end and the integration of Germany becomes a reality. It will be the beginning of a new era in European history and international relations which, we hope, will witness the realization of the century-old dream of a Europe not divided against itself but united in the common pursuit of the best interests of its own peoples and those of all of the Western World.

Unfortunately, Germany's new status will not terminate the division of Germany for the time being. The record of the U.S. Government on the issue of German unity is clear. We have consistently pursued and urged the acceptance of a course of action which, if adopted, would insure reunification of East and West Germany under conditions of freedom. The Soviet Union has agreed to none of our proposals. The question might well be raised whether the Government of the Soviet Union ever seriously intended to support German unification on *any* conditions except her own. As authoritative sources have recently revealed, it was the Soviet Union which insisted on dismemberment of Germany since the days of Tehran. It was the Soviet Union which pointed out that there would always be a strong urge on

⁸ For a statement by Secretary Acheson on U.S. views regarding the integration of Germany into the European community, see BULLETIN of Apr. 7, 1952, p. 530. For an article on postwar efforts to unify Germany, see *ibid.*, Apr. 14, 1952, p. 563.

the part of Germans to unite, and therefore the whole purpose of any international organization must be to neutralize this tendency by applying economic and other measures including, if necessary, force.

German unity is the fondest hope of the German people and a rock-bottom postulate of German foreign policy. The Federal Government is pledged to its realization, but it is the people of Eastern Germany to whom reunification with the West means more than anything else. Tragic isolation and despair blight the life of nearly 20 million of these people. Whoever has talked to Germans from the Soviet zone and has listened to their stories of daily privations will know what freedom means to them. To hear these people pray, "Lord, liberate us," is an experience which nobody could forget. To them we say that the U.S. Government, in alliance with the other Western nations, will not abandon its efforts to restore to these people, by peaceful means, the same rights and liberties which their fellow citizens in the West enjoy today.

Implementing the Contractual Agreements

In the coming years, it will be the task of the U.S. Government, in concert with the German Government and the other signatory powers, to see that the agreements will be implemented so as to insure maximum benefit to all participating nations. This process will require an appropriate adaptation of policies and procedures and, above all, a new spirit in our relations with Germany—a spirit based on cooperation and reciprocity. This spirit does not apply merely to politics and economics; it applies also to the field of cultural relations. This Government is now negotiating a Cultural Convention with the Federal Republic of Germany. Its chief purposes are to encourage and facilitate citizen participation in endeavors furthering international cultural cooperation; to develop and increase the means of communication between the American and the German people; and to sponsor undertakings which will further freedom of communication, freedom of expression, freedom of learning, and freedom of teaching.

What is more, the Cultural Convention is intended to encourage and facilitate the initiation of joint projects designed to promote the principles which the contracting parties are pledged to support. The Governments, however, will not be the

only executive agents of the convention; rather is it the purpose of the convention to stimulate and foster direct contact between citizens' groups of both countries in behalf of programs which will supplement the efforts of their Governments in strategic areas.

I can think of a special assignment which this Government has found difficult to perform adequately in the past, chiefly because of insufficient funds and facilities. I am referring to the kind of program typified by the Cultural Festival in Berlin in September 1951.⁹ At that time the United States in noble competition with Great Britain, France, and Germany presented to the Berliners some of the finest talents in the fields of theater, music, and dance, as well as an exhibition of outstanding American paintings and drawings. The success was overwhelming. For a full month, Berlin became once more the center of world attention and the cultural hub of Germany which it had been in happier days.

The festival helped significantly to boost the morale of the Berliners. Equally important, it netted the United States handsome dividends in the form of inspired comments of acclaim throughout Germany. We are faced today with an all-out drive by the Soviet Union to discredit the cultural achievements of the Western World and to establish itself as the protagonist and protector of civilization. To make their point stick, Soviet agitators never tire of professing a fictitious identity of beliefs and affinities with those of the countries to which they direct their appeal. Venerated symbols of Western culture become the cherished idols of Communist devotion. During the Communist Youth Festival in Berlin last August,¹⁰ I saw posters with the portraits of Goethe, Lessing, and Heine carried through the streets alongside those of Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. Furthermore, the Soviet Government is sending its best artists and its best motion pictures to international cultural festivals and exhibits throughout Europe. Quite often these artists compete with second-grade talents from Western countries. The result is not only that the awards go to the Soviet Union but also that the audience is left with the impression of Western inferiority and poverty *vis-à-vis* the quality of Soviet performance. The Soviet "cul-

⁹ For an article on the Berlin Festival, see *ibid.*, Aug. 20, 1951, p. 292.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Sept. 10, 1951, p. 407 and Sept. 24, 1951, p. 483.

tural offensive," as it has been referred to, presents a real challenge to the free artists of the Western World.¹¹ It is a challenge which must and can best be answered by the voluntary concerted effort of private citizens. What is needed is leadership to enlist and organize the participation of the best talents throughout the Western World, including the United States, in an effort to demonstrate to all and sundry the mighty cultural potential which the United States harbors and sometimes seems to hoard within its borders.

Our Investment in Germany

My purpose has been to show that we have made a long-range investment in Germany which we hope will result in true partnership and lasting peace. It would be presumptuous to claim that we have achieved all that we set out to do. But we can say with pride and with gratitude that we had the good fortune of great leadership as personified in John J. McCloy, the unstinting devotion of his able staff, and the generous support of forward-looking citizens in this country. Our common effort and our hopes for the future can be reduced to one simple formula: to help Germany become a place where the democrats of today will not be the exiles of tomorrow. The day, I hope, will come when we may ask the German people, "Where is your Carl Schurz of today?" And the German people will respond: "He is *our* Secretary of the Interior, *our* legislator, *our* Ambassador, *our* public orator and columnist, and the great model for *our* children. We are proud to have him and we want to keep him."

On that day our investment in Germany will have been redeemed.

West Germany on the Threshold Of Sovereignty

by John J. McCloy
*U.S. High Commissioner for Germany*¹

There are a few points I would like to discuss because decisions of great importance for our future are about to be made. It is essential that the German people fully understand them.

¹¹ For statements on this subject by former Assistant Secretary Barrett and by Assistant Secretary Sargeant, see *ibid.*, Dec. 3, 1951, p. 903, and Apr. 7, 1952, p. 535.

¹ Excerpts from an address made at the dedication of a school at Bernkastel on the Moselle on May 10 and released to the press by Hicog on the same date.

First, I would like to say a few words about the contractual arrangements and the European Defense Community. It is important for all of us, particularly for every German, to see the entire picture. We are engaged in taking three great steps at the same time: We are liquidating a war; we are making peace; and we are concluding a great alliance.

Liquidation of the war is inescapable. It is essential if we are to have a platform upon which to build our alliance of peace. Liquidation means that the German people will be expected to meet certain obligations, to carry certain burdens, and to observe certain limitations that result from the terrible war which, under Hitler's rule, was waged for almost 6 years against the world. Liquidation of this war requires the recognition by Germans of certain principles which will not be given up.

Keep in mind also that the war imposed tremendous burdens on all nations. Today, France, Britain, and the United States, to mention only three countries, are carrying, and will continue to carry, crushing burdens as the aftermath of that war. Moreover the establishment of a partnership to maintain the peace will mean new burdens and obligations for all Western nations. For my own country, the commitments being made in the contractual agreements are unprecedented in our history. In the weeks ahead Germans must look at the agreements as a whole and not only at those provisions which cover obligations the Federal Republic will assume. The commitment to stand together is mutual and in our mutual interest.

The governments and public opinion in the Western countries have come a long way since 1945 in extending friendship to the German people. They have given the German people vital support in the rebuilding of this country. They honestly wish to see the Federal Republic associated with them in equal partnership. The agreements we are soon to sign are solid proof of our desire for peaceful alliance.

In the face of the Communist threat, I believe the people of the Federal Republic know that their personal liberties and peace would be jeopardized if they did not join in partnership with the West. They recognize that in partnership there is give and take, there are burdens and rewards. In our peaceful alliance, Germany will not dominate or be dominated. We must all work together. Above all, the German people know, I am sure, that in the partnership of the European-Atlantic community there is the best chance of security, liberty, prosperity—and the reunification of the German people.

Now may I say a few words about German reunification and the exchange of notes that is presently going on.²

² For texts of the Soviet note of Mar. 10 on German unification and the U.S. reply of Mar. 25, see *BULLETIN* of Apr. 7, 1952, p. 530; for texts of the Soviet note of Apr. 9 and the U.S. reply of May 13, see *ibid.*, May 26, 1952, p. 817.

We have had many deep disappointments in our relations with the Soviet Union since 1945. The 19 million Germans in the East zone of Germany and in East Berlin have had their own bitter experience of life under Soviet control. All of us know—if we look at Communist aggression in Korea, if we observe the armistice negotiations there, if we consider the conferences on German unification at the Palais Rose—that dealing with the Communists is difficult, time consuming, and frustrating. That is why in the present exchange of notes we are not prepared to play the role of Alice in Wonderland. We want firm evidence, firm facts. We have all suffered too much—Germans included—to jeopardize the progress we have made.

I am certain that in the forthcoming reply to the last Soviet note we will do everything possible to explore honest moves in the direction of German unity.

What I shall now say will not be included in any note. The Soviets would demonstrate much more sincerity, if, instead of spreading their so-called peace and unity propaganda, they would do something or other along the following lines:

Immediately release all German prisoners of war from Soviet camps.

Immediately release all political prisoners from the jails of the East zone.

Permit the free and unlimited circulation of West Berlin, West German, and other newspapers and magazines in the East sector and East zone of Germany.

If the Soviets are sincere about unification they will free all innocent German men and women from their places of detention. Certainly they should not object to the free exchange of published material between both parts of Germany now throttled by their policy of censorship and control. German unification would be nearer if the citizens of Dresden, Leipzig, and all parts of the Soviet zone of Germany could read without any fear or punishment the newspapers of West Berlin, Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Munich, and Hamburg.

Before I close I want to say a few words to the young people here. Our participation in the building of this *Berufsschule* [vocational school] is an indication of the faith we have in the youth of this country. It has been a deep satisfaction to me that the United States has been able to aid in the building of hundreds of projects for youth in Germany—youth centers, student dormitories, teacher-training institutes, and many others.

We have one idea only—to help free boys and girls become citizens of Europe, citizens of the world.

In the coming weeks the agreements we are to sign will be an act of faith—faith in a free Europe and a free world. All of us, particularly the youth, now have the opportunity to transform this faith into living reality.

U.S. Policy on Trade Restrictions

Text of U.S. Note

[Released to the press May 12]

*The Department of State on May 11 handed to the British Embassy the following reply to the aide-mémoire which the British Embassy delivered to the Department of State on April 10, 1952, and later published on April 18:*¹

The British Embassy's aide-mémoire of April 9, 1952, expressing concern at the number of applications presented to the United States Tariff Commission for action under Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 has been given careful study in the Department of State.

It is true that in recent months there has been an increase in the number of investigations ordered by the Tariff Commission in response to applications from United States industry. Furthermore, it is recognized that several of these investigations relate to products of importance in the export trade of the United Kingdom and other countries which have made serious efforts to increase their dollar earnings by sales to the United States, and which are concerned lest these efforts be frustrated.

The Department of State has always taken the position that modifications of duty concessions should only be made in cases of genuinely serious injury or threat of injury resulting from trade commitments. The Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom are in complete accord in their insistence that the obligations in Article XIX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade should be scrupulously observed, and that Article XIX should not be invoked merely because a concession results in more vigorous competition from imports.

Furthermore, it is the opinion of the Department of State that in cases where modifications of duties are made as a result of escape clause investigations such modifications should be kept under constant review to insure their remaining in force for only such time and to such extent as is necessary to prevent or remedy the injury to domestic industry. Accordingly, a system providing for the periodic investigation and report by the Tariff Commission on all escape clause actions is in the process of being established.

The attitude of the United States Government on the basic principle of lowering barriers to international trade remains unchanged, and any tendency to deviate from that principle, wherever it may arise, is the subject of concern to the Department of State. Cooperative action among all free nations to reduce and minimize trade barriers between us is essential if we are to provide a strong economic basis for our mutual security and progress.

¹ For text of the British note and a statement by Secretary Acheson, see BULLETIN of May 12, 1952, p. 737.

Some Foreign Policy Crossroads

by Francis H. Russell

Director of the Office of Public Affairs¹

We are confronted these days with some especially crucial questions of foreign policy.

As we face into them, let us make note that we have in a special sense been strengthened by our trials of the past few years. Do not all of us today feel closer than ever to that company of patriots who have struggled for freedom before us? Does not Jefferson's statement: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man" have a more acute meaning than it had before? Is not Washington more real because we are more deeply engaged than ever in trying to keep aloft that "standard to which the wise and the good may repair"?

We are finding that every person today—literally every person—is being forced to answer the question "How much does freedom mean to me?"—to answer it in concrete terms of our willingness to pay the necessary taxes, in terms of deprivations of various kinds, in terms of military training, in terms of fighting and dying.

And especially we are having to answer it in terms of hard, straight, and responsible thinking, because we know that what results from this thinking will determine the shape of things to come for a long, long time.

U.S. Attitude Toward World Leadership

What are these present-day questions?

The first is this. What attitude do we take toward the role of world leadership that has been thrust upon us? That has to be answered first, before anything else.

Why?

¹ Address made before the International Association of Machinists at St. Louis, Mo., on May 24 and released to the press on the same date.

This is not a leadership that this country obtained by grabbing for it. Never in history has leadership—world leadership—been thrust upon a more reluctant people. After World War II we were weary of war—tired to death of everything that pertained to war. Our men overseas wanted to come home and get out of uniform. We wanted our factories back in peacetime production. Many of us wanted to wipe the dust of the world off our feet.

We found that was a mood that could not last. For one thing there was a candidate for the role, a candidate that was active but unacceptable. The men in the Kremlin were entirely willing to assume the responsibility. There was no reluctance there. The Iron Curtain had already closed down on a sizeable portion of the world's surface. We saw, and the world saw, that Russian "leadership" had become a living nightmare to hundreds of millions.

So the United States entered upon its task. The job would have been relatively simple if we could have adopted the Russian pattern of "leadership," if we could have *forced* unity upon the free world. But then it would not have been the *free world*. We do not want puppets. We want allies in a common purpose.

This kind of leadership is something entirely new in the world. There is no precedent in history to which we can turn for procedures. There have been plenty of world empires. The great British historian, Toynbee, if I remember correctly, names twenty-one. But they were empires. Their rulers did not lead. They controlled. The Russians do that. Their "friends" are satellites, cogs in the Communist machine. Neither the peoples nor their governments have a voice in the operation of that machine.

What we are doing is to help in building a new

world society based upon respect for the integrity and independence of all nations with cooperation as its basic principle. Whether we succeed will decide whether the present free world order goes down in history as the twenty-second in some future Toynbee's list of deceased civilizations—inadequate to the demands of the age—or as the beginning of a stable world structure.

This leadership on our part was first expressed in our support of the United Nations. It had the hearty approval of practically the entire citizenry of the United States. The Senate voted 89 to 2 in favor of ratification of the Charter. Approval cut across party lines and included individuals and groups active in both national and international affairs.

By and large this support continues. But there has been some weakening.

Proposals To Restrict Treaty Making

For instance, there is a resolution now before the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 130, which proposes to amend the provision of the Constitution relating to the making of treaties and executive agreements. Section I of this proposed amendment provides in part that "no treaty . . . shall be made respecting the rights of citizens of the United States protected by this Constitution. . . ." This would prevent this country from taking part in any international agreement designed to extend the human rights which we enjoy in this country to other parts of the world.

Section II of the proposed amendment provides in part that "no treaty . . . shall vest in any international organization . . . any of the legislative, executive or judicial powers (of our Federal Government)." This would raise serious question about our ability to proceed with our allies under NATO, designed to strengthen the security of the North Atlantic area against aggression.

Section III provides in part that "no treaty . . . shall alter . . . the laws of the United States or the Constitution or laws of the several states unless . . . Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution." This means in effect that every treaty will have to go through a new laborious and double process in order to become effective. The Senate would have to give its advice and consent by two-thirds majority and then both Houses would have to pass implementing legislation.

Section IV provides in part that "executive agreements shall not be made in lieu of treaties." This provision would in practice prevent the executive branch of the Government from effectively carrying on foreign relations. A large number of exchanges of notes with foreign powers constitute an executive agreement.

The principal sponsor of this resolution has declared that "the paramount issue of our time is whether or not the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States shall be preserved." He

expressed concern that the United Nations might interfere with that sovereignty and supersede the Constitution.

I think he thoroughly misunderstands the United Nations and our commitments under the U.N. Charter. A decision of the U.S. Supreme Court (*Asakura v. the City of Seattle*) in 1923 made it clear that the Constitution of the United States is supreme over a treaty. The U.N. Charter is a treaty. If a U.N. commitment should be made that violated the Constitution, it would be null and void. So that cannot be a reason for changing the Constitution.

I do not propose to discuss the resolution in detail. My chief concern with it this evening is the implication that the United Nations, somehow, is a threat to the individual liberty of citizens of the United States, that we have "lost something" under the U.N. Charter, when in fact we have gained immeasurably.

The attack on the Covenant on Human Rights, now being drafted in the United Nations, is another example of what I have been talking about.

As presently drafted, not only are the articles on civil and political rights in the Covenant consistent with the Constitution of the United States, but the Bill of Rights in the Constitution is one of the primary documents from which both the idea and the substance of the Covenant stem.

We have to remember that our Bill of Rights assures to the people of the United States rights almost unknown to hundreds of millions of other human beings. We accept them as fundamentals of our way of life. To others they are only promises of what they would like—of which they have dreamed.

Last week I was in Williamsburg, Va., when an exhibit of famous documents relating to human rights was opened to the public. As I stood in front of the exhibit of George Mason's draft of the Virginia Bill of Rights, a woman in front of me turned away, visibly weeping. She was a refugee from an Iron Curtain country, and she said to me, almost angrily: "You Americans, you do not appreciate what you have." I replied, "Oh, I think we do." She said, "No. You do not cry."

When we attack the proposed Covenant on Human Rights, it looks to others very much as though we, with our human rights so well advanced, were taking a dog-in-the-manger attitude—that we are not willing to help other peoples share them.

This new attitude toward the United Nations is dangerous. It could well wreck our effort to find some way other than war to settle the world's problems.

U.N. Efforts in Korea Justified

Closely related to these questions is what our attitude is, and shall be, toward measures to put down Communist aggression. The invasion of

the Republic of Korea in 1950 was more than an attack on a small country; it was a defiance of the United Nations. For the first time in history aggression was met by the combined efforts of loyal members of an international organization representing the world community.

The free world has paid a high price in Korea. But had that action not been taken the price might well have been civilization itself.

There are many of us who remember the desperate attempts of the late Henry Stimson, then the U.S. Secretary of State, to bring the moral pressures of the world to bear upon the aggressor in Manchuria. Later, the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie, standing alone before the General Assembly of the League of Nations, begged in vain for aid to defend his homeland.

Both Stimson and the Ethiopian Emperor warned the world that in the unchecked aggression, then loose in the world, more than the fate of just the countries immediately concerned was involved. But the world, back in the thirties, turned deaf ears upon the warning. With success, the appetites of the aggressors grew. Manchuria and Ethiopia led to the Rhineland, Munich, Poland, and Pearl Harbor.

Had the United Nations not acted in Korea, the security of the non-Communist Far East would have been seriously jeopardized. For example, the failure of the United Nations to meet the challenge in Korea might well have encouraged a similar aggression against Indochina. Indochina is the gateway to Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, and Malaya. If the Communists had taken over these they would have outflanked India and Pakistan.

Had the United Nations not acted, Japan would be in grave danger today. And Japan is the third greatest industrial area of the world.

The men of the Kremlin knew very well what their objectives were in Korea. A secret intelligence report on a speech made by a Red army officer to his troops just before the invasion has been made public.

The Red officer said:

In order to undertake the long-awaited world revolution we must first unify Asia. Java, Indochina, Malaya, India, Tibet, Thailand, the Philippines, and Japan are our ultimate targets.

The United States' role in the defense of freedom in Korea was shown clearly by the same officer, for in continuing his talk he said:

The United States is the only obstacle in our road. We must crush the United States.

Those are words every American should take into consideration when he thinks about Korea.

A veteran of the Korean conflict, Capt. James Jabara, ace jet pilot, was greeted by a reporter from his home town of Wichita, Kans. The reporter asked him: "Why are we fighting in Korea, Captain?" Jabara answered: "So we won't have to fight in Wichita."

That is the answer to "why Korea."

Proof of Success for Free World

I suppose we might have expected that there would be a few among us who would react to the present world situation by becoming hysterical. And sure enough there are those who, for instance, are crying: "The free world is losing the Cold War at the rate of a hundred million people a year." It must have been just such men Tom Paine was talking about when he said: "It is the business of little minds to shrink. I love the man that can smile in trouble," and referred to such panics as "the touchstones of sincerity and hypocrisy, which sift out the hidden thoughts of men, and hold them up in public to the world."

What do these people mean by this statement, "The free world is losing the Cold War at the rate of a hundred million people a year"? We have heard it over the radio and seen it in magazines and newspaper reports of speeches. It has become a kind of slogan.

The free world hasn't lost a hundred million people this year. The free world didn't lose a hundred million people last year. It didn't lose a hundred million people in 1950. In fact, we gained several hundred thousand, those who could no longer stand life under a police regime and came streaming over to the free world across what the Kremlin was trying to make into an Iron Curtain.

What these hysterical people refer to, I suppose, are two developments. In 1946-47 the Kremlin imposed Communist regimes on the countries in Eastern Europe which it had occupied during the war and which it still occupied or surrounded. The second development was the victory of the Communist forces over the Republic of China in spite of tremendous amounts of aid given to that Government by the United States. In both of these cases the development could have been prevented only by sending in American officers, American soldiers, American planes, and, in the case of China at least, by an American domination of the country to an extent that would have built up fierce resentments not only there but in other countries now on our side—and would have involved us in a war whose dimensions would be many times that of Korea.

They were tragic developments—make no mistake about it—but when in the long struggle for freedom has the course ever been without its set-backs?

Let us remember, those who are for freedom, that while these set-backs were being incurred we have been having some victories.

One of the Iron Curtain countries, Yugoslavia, has made the break.

Other countries in the free world, such as India and Pakistan, are becoming more wary of communism. The fact is that the population of the free world is today twice that of the Communist world including China. Europe, a powerhouse

of freedom second only to the United States, is strong and getting stronger.

Perhaps the best index of our success, the best index of the strength of the free world relative to the Soviet world in terms of their productive capacity either for war or for peace, are the figures on steel production. The estimated steel production in metric tons for the entire world last year was 206 million tons. Of that production, 163 million, or three-fourths of the world's production, was in countries of the free world. Ninety-five million, or slightly less than one-half was in the United States. Fifty-eight million, or a little more than one-fourth, was in Western Europe.

Only 38 million, or approximately one-fifth, is produced by all the Communist countries put together, including the Soviet Union.

The steel production of China, incidentally, is only one tenth of a million tons, or 1/2,000 of the world's production. Japan with its production of 6½ million tons is on the side of the free world.

But then it is asked, "Assuming we have been making headway, do we have what it takes to maintain this leadership?" Take an editorial that appeared a few days ago in the *Omaha World-Herald*. It quotes Senator Saltonstall:

Suppose that we give you 60 billions for fiscal '53 and then 60 billions for fiscal '54 and, let's assume 60 billions for '55. Where do we come out? Where do we stand at that point with respect to our foreign policy?

And the *World-Herald* goes on:

Airplanes, the latest jet-powered models, both fighters and bombers, will be flowing out of the factories. . . . Atom bombs will be turned out at a frightening rate. . . . Other weapons and ordnance will be piling up. . . . Then what to do? . . . The questions are . . . real and urgent. For the truth is that there is just one classical historical way in which nations dispose of their store of weapons—and that is in war against other nations. Almost always in the past, the very act of getting ready for war has led to war. . . . Even if the United States should gain the advantage by the year 1955, would that fact be translated automatically into world serenity? A defense program which will cost the people at least 60 billion dollars a year should have an aim, a goal.

Those are real questions, and the American people ought to be clear about the answers.

We are living in a time when the free world must have armaments, stupendous amounts of them, if it is to hold back a conspiratorial world power that is prepared to use military might to accomplish its goal of world domination. Second only to that threat is the danger the *World-Herald* refers to, that too many people will become impatient, will become unnerved, will become reckless.

The Principles of Cooperation and Reciprocity

Can the people of the free world—and the decision will rest here in the United States to a greater degree than anywhere else—can the people of the free world carry the tremendous burden of being

militarily strong and still regard that military strength only as a protection for doing something that is even more important—the constant pushing forward of the cause of freedom accompanied by a vigorous campaign of peace?

There is no single answer to this. We have to answer it every day.

For instance, we talk to our friends and allies about the necessity of their cooperating. If our words are to carry meaning, we are going to have to proceed on the principle of cooperation ourselves.

We have been, of course. Under the Mutual Security Program we are helping with both military and economic aid. We are sharing generously both our skills and resources.

But there is more to it than that. Our allies are no more anxious to be continually in the position of receiving gifts than we are to be continually making them. They want, as far and as fast as possible, to stand on their own.

We have got to let them do it. What I am talking about here, of course, is international trade.

Let us take Japan by way of example. Here is a country now on its own. It is being brought back into the family of free nations on a basis of equality. It wants to earn its way as a member of the world community. It has the human resources of energy and skill to do it. But if we, and the other free nations, shut our doors to Japanese products, Japan simply will not be able to do it. Her people must eat. They must have shelter and clothing. All three cost money. And if they can't sell, they can't buy. Inability to earn the resources necessary for self-support through trade with the free nations will inevitably increase the lure of potential trade elsewhere. And both Communist China and Russia are very eager to trade with Japan. They want not only her products but a close relationship with her people. And they want, most of all, to prove to her, and to the other Asiatic nations, that the cooperation the United States talks about stops at our own frontiers.

It was not a coincidence that a so-called Economic Conference was staged at Moscow in April. We cannot blink the fact that the Conference had propaganda results.

I am not talking about flooding American markets with foreign goods. Our gross national product is over 325 billion dollars per year. It has increased 100 billion dollars in the last 5 years. The best that foreign suppliers could do would be only a very small percentage of that. But what are small percentages to us are often matters of life or death to the other countries.

There is no quick and easy answer to this problem, but in approaching it we need to bear in mind that every time we take action to restrict the imports of some specific commodity, we do much more than affect a limited and special situation. We create fear in the hearts of all those who are

endeavoring to sell in the American market and who must sell if they are to earn dollars to buy our goods. What may seem to be a small, unimportant action can have serious consequences when measured against the total picture. We create grave uncertainty about the prospects of creating a healthy world economy. We undermine our leadership not only in the economic field but across the board.

But the final answer to the Omaha *World-Herald's* question lies in the fact that goods are not all we have to export. What we have learned in the 176 years of our existence as a Nation is, in the last analysis, our greatest export.

We are not just anti-Communist. We are affirmatists. We are resisting communism because it is bent on tearing down our work. We have been engaged, in our life as a Nation, in bringing into existence a set of principles which are today, no less than when Lincoln spoke, the "best hope of earth." They underlie our daily pattern of living, our unmatched economy, and our Government.

We believe, as George Mason of Virginia put it, that of all the forms of government "that is best which is capable of producing the greatest degree of happiness" and that the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people only "by frequent recurrence" to these fundamental principles.

But these principles are as broad as humanity itself. They derive from the experience of the ages, from man's growing knowledge of himself, and from spiritual insights.

Their characteristic is a concern for human happiness based on human rights and a belief in the possibility of progress, if enough people desire it. From them flows our faith in a pluralistic society over a monolithic totalitarianism, and our belief in the separation of powers in government; public schools, academic freedom, and a free press; the separation of church and state with equal freedom of all religions; free enterprise, with a special concern for the preservation of small businesses; and a strong labor-union movement to deal equally with our strong and flourishing business organizations.

We cannot, of course, impose this revolution on other people. It was a part of the revolution of the free mind which held that it is through the inquiring mind that we come upon the eternal truths. Our revolution was a revolt against the imposing of beliefs on any people. And to *impose* a free mind upon anyone is a contradiction in terms.

Our revolution remains, in the long run, the supreme attraction. Precisely because of its derivations, it holds up the goal toward which all men move. That is the real answer to the question whether we can make our present effort with confidence in the outcome.

It is, in part, an act of faith; but it is a faith that Americans have long held and not in vain.

Special Significance of World Trade Week

Press Conference Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press May 21]

We are celebrating World Trade Week. This year, at a time when the free world is joined in a gigantic effort to build a common defense against aggression, World Trade Week takes on a special significance.

To build the defensive strength of the free nations, each is contributing its resources and its strength. As its contribution, the United States has undertaken to expand its own defenses and is aiding other countries so that they may be better able to make a larger contribution from their own resources.

Increased international trade plays a key role in this program. It permits each nation to make its best contribution by utilizing its resources, plants, and manpower in the most economic manner. By permitting nations to sell to other nations of the free world the products which each is best able to produce, international trade adds to the economic strength upon which our common defense is based.

All of us as taxpayers are aware of the costs of our aid programs. However, that aid can be cut down if friendly foreign nations can earn their dollars by selling their products to us. As opportunities increase for our friends and allies to earn the dollars they need to buy the products they require for the common defense, their need for financial aid from the United States will decline. Our best course is to insure that these countries are not hampered in their efforts to sell us the things they produce best.

As long as our exports exceed our imports by such large sums as they have for the last 33 years—totaling over 80 billion dollars—foreign countries will not be able to pay for the American goods they need.

We have three choices:

The United States can cut its exports, which would have a serious effect on the U.S. economy and create unemployment.

We can continue indefinitely to make gifts of dollars, which means the United States will never be paid for its exports and the American taxpayer will make up the difference.

Or we can allow the nations of the free world who need American products for our joint defense to sell us their products and so help earn the dollars they need to pay us. This is by far the best solution.

In the collective interests of the free world and the interests of the United States, it becomes obvious that we need a forward-looking trade policy designed to achieve genuine prosperity for ourselves and other free nations.

The Voice of America at the Water's Edge

by Wilson Compton

Administrator, U.S. International Information Administration¹

IN OCTOBER 1948, just before the last national election, an eminent American who knew what he was talking about spoke quietly and proudly of American unity. This is what he said:

"The important thing to celebrate tonight is the fact that . . . as the result of constructive collaboration, we have produced to a remarkable extent a united unpartisan voice for America at the water's edge . . . We have learned to speak as the United States, and not as the disunited States."

These are the words of the late Senator from Michigan, Arthur H. Vandenberg. We must restore the significance of those words and fortify them in our action as well as in our thinking. Perhaps as much as any other American statesman, Senator Vandenberg was responsible for political bipartisanship in United States foreign policy. His was a vital influence, also, in the alignment of what he called the nonpartisan support of the American people behind the United States course of action in the world.

"This unity," Senator Vandenberg declared, "is the equivalent of many an armed division upon the land, many a flight of eagles in the sky, and many a fleet of ships upon the sea in terms of national security."

¹ Address made before the Atlantic Union Committee at Washington on May 21. Also printed as Department of State publication 4609.

A Nonpartisan Approach to World Affairs

Our fundamental foreign policy, after all, is not complicated unless we make it so. It has developed gradually as we have grown from the simple beginnings of a little Republic on a new continent to the elaborate mesh of international relations of a mighty Nation in a world united physically but desperately divided ideologically. Our underlying foreign policy has not much changed with our frequent political changes at home. It may fairly be called an American policy. It is at the point at which we must apply that policy to the complicated, fast-changing local conditions throughout a world in ferment that our greatest difficulties arise.

Our nonpartisan approach to world affairs has been possible, in general, because the people of the United States have understood the need of conveying to the world and to all its peoples the idea of a united America—united in purpose, united in action, and, especially, united in spirit.

With this nonpartisan approach to world affairs, the United States has successfully engaged in many major international undertakings on behalf of freedom and security in all parts of the world. Among the milestones in the recent course of these events have been the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations, the Treaty of Rio, aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall Plan, Point Four, the

North Atlantic Treaty, and the Pacific security treaties. We have undertaken these measures in the interest of our own security and for the protection of those elsewhere upon whose security also depends our own. These undertakings would not have been possible without American unity.

The Smith-Mundt Act, the basic legislation for our overseas information service, also was initiated with nonpartisan support of Americans, regardless of religion, political creed, or racial origin. In carrying overseas the Campaign of Truth, the voices of millions of the American people speak the truth to the world. It is not the voice of any group, any class, any special interest. Its voice speaks from the principles expressed in the Bill of Rights, interpreted today in the way we live, think, and work and, if necessary, fight. It is a reflection of what we are as a Nation and of what in a world at peace we hope to be.

A World-Wide Investment in Ideas

If we want peace and if we expect to attain peace, we must make an investment in ideas and that investment, I believe, must be world-wide. It must eventually be a greater investment than as a Nation we are prepared to make now.

This is not a sole responsibility of government. It is a responsibility and an opportunity shared by all Americans who are interested in what happens to their children and their grandchildren. I happen to be the Administrator of our Government's principal undertaking in this world-wide "war of ideas," the United States International Information Administration. It shares these responsibilities with other agencies of the Government. But it is the only one which has for these purposes a world-wide organization and undertakes these activities world-wide. We are concerned, of course, in the effectiveness of our own services. We are equally concerned in encouraging the similar undertakings of American private agencies and of American citizens generally—who seek mutual understanding among nations and among peoples, who seek peace with freedom.

Historically the "Voice of America" has been expressed largely through normal trade and commerce, travel and ordinary communications. These channels have been interrupted, retarded,

or even choked by wars and "cold wars." Some now have been virtually closed, such as the road to giant China which, after a few decades of seeing the sun, seems to be turning to a new "dark age." We should seek the restoration of these normal "voices" of America, which, over the years of our national life, have established the United States and the American people in a place high in the understanding, respect, and confidence of other peoples throughout the world, including millions who, today, either willingly or unwillingly, are governed by rulers hostile to our way of life, who seek its destruction.

The Struggle for Men's Minds

This is a day of decisions—big decisions. One of the biggest decisions facing the free world today is whether collectively we are able to make and willing to make the effort needed to win the contest for men's minds—a decision which may largely determine whether the "big truth" or the "big lie" will prevail. The outcome of this struggle may well mean ultimately the difference between world peace and world war. Can the free peoples of the world win with ideas a peace which can never be won with armed might alone? It can if we do our part. We can do our part if we are able to speak with a Voice united at the water's edge.

This will not be done unless we keep on trying and unless we are willing to support, as well as to criticize, the only agencies we have through which we may even keep on trying. There is no reason to believe that we are losing the contest for men's minds. Also there is no reason to say that we are winning it. This is not a battle, but a war, even though a "cold" war. It will last a long time. It may last indefinitely.

May we for a moment consider the objectives of our International Information and Educational Exchange Program and the tools with which it works within the free world. A basic premise of American foreign policy is to build unity and strength among the free peoples sufficient to deter aggression and, if necessary, to defeat it. The information program is concerned with the ideological base of this movement for unity and strength; with the ideas and purposes which we and the other free nations hold in common. It is seeking to strengthen the morale and the spiritual ties between ourselves and like-

mindful peoples. It is seeking to convert attitudes of neutralism where they exist among free peoples into a spirit of determination. There is a vast difference between opinion and conviction; between wishing and determination. Among freedom-loving peoples, who have been numbed by years of frustration and fear, we are seeking to strengthen their conviction and to fortify their determination. Determination is a product of the mind, not of the factory. This is a big job. It is not the job of America alone. We are big. But we are not that big.

We must, of course, seek the political and military cooperation of other free governments. We are doing so. We must seek also the understanding, respect, and confidence of their peoples. Our Voice of America, therefore, in its expression overseas stresses the interests which we have in common. It seeks to present an honest view of an honest America, to express our national interest in knowing and in understanding other peoples; to keep other peoples alert to the menace of international communism; and to strengthen the confidence of other nations that America stands shoulder to shoulder with them in the mutual struggle for a better and safer world. In a word the Voice of America represents American aspirations. If, as a Nation, we do not aspire, we shall eventually wither.

The "Tools" of the Program

What are the weapons available to us collectively in this struggle for men's minds? Insofar as we choose to speak through agencies of our Government, our principal means are those of the United States International Information Administration through the use of radio, motion pictures, the press, publications, overseas information centers, and the widely publicized exchange of persons.

Our radio broadcasts, commonly known as the Voice of America, now are carrying our message overseas in 46 languages. It reaches nearly 100 countries. It operates around the clock, and its potential audience is numbered in the tens of millions daily.

Our international press and publications service, including our daily *Wireless Bulletin*, reaches more than 100,000,000 readers. Our motion pictures, produced in 40 different lan-

guages, tell an American story to an annual gross audience of over 400,000,000 persons. These are effective principally in areas where most people cannot read.

Other countries are learning about the United States and its ways also through our information centers located in more than 150 strategic localities overseas, where they work closely with local editors, radio commentators, and community leaders generally.

In the past year nearly 8,000 students, teachers, professors, and leaders came to this country from abroad or went overseas on United States Government-sponsored grants. Many thousands more were sponsored through private agencies. We are now emphasizing the exchange of leaders who are in a position to be molders of opinion—journalists, labor leaders, government officials—who, if they wish, can spread the truth among their own peoples when they return to their homes. There is no more effective answer to the "big lie" than to expose it first-hand. Is there a genuine interest in these exchanges of persons? Recently in a single city of India there were available 60 of these grants for study in America, and for these 60 there were 22,000 qualified applicants.

Effectiveness of the Program

These are valuable tools. We are only beginning to use them. Today the American people generally regard the Voice of America as an interesting experiment toward peace. But they do not know much about it. Some are dubious. Some are enthusiastic. Some think it is not a proper function of government in a free society. Others think it is indispensable unless we wish to abandon the "big truth" and leave the war of ideas throughout the world to the mercy of the "big lie." Some think it is all right in principle but that it cannot be effective in practice. Some think it is relatively unimportant; others that it is more important than battleships, bombs, and guns. I believe that the International Information and Exchange of Persons Program, if it is patiently developed, may eventually make the difference between world peace and world war. But its success depends as much upon public understanding of it and interest in it here at home as upon the effectiveness of its efforts overseas.

Since the Voice of America is beamed entirely overseas and mostly in foreign languages, it is rare that anyone in the United States ever hears it. This is almost equally true of its International Press Service, which goes to nearly 10,000 newspapers abroad, and to its mobile Motion-Picture Service, which is one of its most effective means of reaching illiterate populations with a message of hope and encouragement from America. The part of this program most visible here at home, in fact the only one, is the exchange of persons which annually brings here thousands of teachers, students, and leaders from overseas.

This program needs criticism, informed criticism. Also, it needs support, informed support. It needs the understanding of patriot groups, such as your own, which, in other ways, are seeking the keys to peace. One of the issues on which particularly we need public understanding is in the growing contest between the "big truth" and the "big lie." Recent attempted gigantic swindles of the people of the world, such as the immoral propaganda of the alleged use of germ warfare in Korea by United Nations forces and, within the past fortnight, the twisted interpretation of the unhappy events concerning the outbreaks in the Koje-do prison camp in South Korea, have more than ever sharpened the menace of the "big lie."

I believe firmly in the policy so strongly asserted by Senator Vandenberg that our political disagreements should stop at the water's edge, that if we have severe issues over policies, as we do have, we should fight them out and settle them at home and not debate them abroad. Just as firmly do I believe that America's voice overseas should always be, as always it has been, the voice of truth. The United States of America, since the beginning of the Republic, has made a world-wide imprint as a Christian

Nation with a moral sense, composed of honorable people, whose word is good, who value their freedom, their right, and their chance to choose, who wish to be good neighbors, who would like to help other people to the same opportunities which they seek for themselves, who want peace. It would be wholly out of character for us to use the immoral propaganda techniques of international communism. We would lose even if we won, and we would be defrauding our grandchildren of their greatest heritage. Theodore Roosevelt in another period of turmoil said: "Speak plainly, speak softly, and carry a big stick." The Voice of America will never be the voice of Americans unless it is the voice of truth.

The Secretary of State, in a public address on the "Strategy of Freedom,"² spoke of the elements of our national foreign policy by which we seek to avoid war and to secure peace. He stated that these elements constitute a "national policy and not a party policy."

"It is right and proper," said he "that there should be differences of opinion among us about the execution of [our national] policy, and about questions of emphasis, priorities, application and administration. No one has a monopoly of wisdom; and the vigor and vitality of a democratic society derive from free discussion and debate and the consent which flows from understanding. However vigorous our debates may be, it should be made clear to all that our country is united in its determination to hew to the Strategy of Freedom which is our national policy."

With equal emphasis, his concluding words may be applied to our actions today at the water's edge:

"The nation's peril is our challenge. The united will of the people must be our answer."

² BULLETIN of Dec. 18, 1950, p. 962.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned During May 1952

UN (United Nations):		
Economic and Social Council:		
Narcotic Drugs Commission: 7th Session	New York	Apr. 15-May 14
Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices: 2d Meeting.	New York	Apr. 28-May 10
Social Commission: 8th Session	New York	May 12-30
Trusteeship Council:		
Standing Committee on Administrative Unions	New York	May 5-10
Committee on General Procedures	New York	May 5-10
Standing Committee on Petitions	New York	May 5-10
International Wheat Council: 8th Session	London	Apr. 17-May 9
ILO (International Labor Organization):		
Metal Trades Committee: 4th Session	Geneva	Apr. 21-May 3
Iron and Steel Committee: 4th Session	Geneva	May 5-17
Governing Body: 119th Session	Geneva	May 26-31
ITU (International Telecommunication Union):		
Administrative Council: 7th Session	Geneva	Apr. 21-May 17
CCIR International Radio Consultative Committee:		
Study Group V	Stockholm	May 15-25
Study Group VI	Stockholm	May 15-27
Study Group XI	Stockholm	May 20-28
Cannes International Film Festival	Cannes	Apr. 23-May 10
South Pacific Commission: 9th Session	Nouméa	Apr. 28-May 7
6th International Hydrographic Conference	Monaco	Apr. 29-May 9
NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization):		
Petroleum Planning Committee, Meeting of Working Group	Paris	May 1-12
Planning Board for Ocean Shipping: 4th Meeting	Washington	May 13-15
Petroleum Planning Committee: 2d Meeting	Paris	May 19-21
FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization):		
Poplar Commission, International, 6th Session	Rome	May 26-28
Working Party on Fertilizers	Bandung, Indonesia	May 5-10
Rice Breeders Working Party	Bandung, Indonesia	May 5-10
Meeting on Fisheries Statistics	Copenhagen	May 26-31
International Rice Commission: 3d Session	Bandung, Indonesia	May 12-16
Diplomatic Conference on Maritime Law	Brussels	May 2-10
WHO (World Health Organization): 5th Assembly	Geneva	May 5-23
International Rubber Study Group: 9th Meeting	Ottawa	May 5-9
Caribbean Commission: 14th Meeting	Guadeloupe	May 6-11
International Symposium on Problems of Desert Research	Jerusalem	May 7-14
Sample Fairs	Valencia	May 10-30
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
Council: 16th Session	Montreal	May 13-23
Air Navigation Commission: 10th Session	Montreal	May 13-23
South Pacific Commission: Fisheries Conference	Nouméa	May 14-23*
International Cotton Advisory Committee: 11th Session	Rome	May 17-31

In Session as of May 31, 1952

International Materials Conference	Washington	Feb. 26, 1951
Four Power Conference on Swiss-Allied Accord	Bern	Mar. 5, 1951
West Point Sesquicentennial	West Point	January-
International Conference on German Debts	London	Feb. 28-
International Exhibition of Drawings and Engravings	Lugano, Switzerland	Apr. 10-
UN (United Nations):		
Economic and Social Council:		
Human Rights Commission: 8th Session	New York	Apr. 14-
14th Session of Council	New York	May 20-
International Court of Justice	The Hague	May 26-

¹ Prepared in the Division of International Conferences, Department of State, May 22, 1952. Asterisks indicate tentative dates.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

In Session as of May 31, 1952—Continued

13th Congress of the Universal Postal Union	Brussels	May 14-
Paris International Trade Exhibition	Paris	May 17-
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
Standing Committee on Aircraft Performance: 2d Meeting	Copenhagen	May 19-
Annual Assembly: 6th	Montreal	May 27-
UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization):		
Executive Board: 30th Session	Paris	May 24-
WMO (World Meteorological Organization):		
Regional Association for Europe: 1st Session	Zürich	May 26-
9th International Congress of Agricultural Industries	Rome	May 27-
International Conference on Large Electric High Tension Systems: 14th Session	Paris	May 28-
WHO (World Health Organization):		
Executive Board: 10th Session	Geneva	May 29-

Scheduled June 1-August 31, 1952

International Convention for Protection of Industrial Property	Vienna	June 2-
FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization):		
Meeting of Committee on Commodity Problems	Rome	June 3-
Council: 15th Session	Rome	June 9-
Latin American Forestry Commission: 4th Session	Buenos Aires	June 16-
Meeting of Working Party on Torrent Control and Protection of Avalanches	Nice	June 28-
FAO-Caribbean Commission: 2d Regional Conference on Home Economics and Education in Nutrition	Port-of-Spain	June 30-
UN (United Nations):		
Trusteeship Council: 11th Session	New York	June 3-
Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East: 2d Meeting of Working Party on Small Scale Industries and Handicrafts Marketing	Bangkok	July 28-
Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: 3d Session	New York	Aug. 14-
Ad Hoc Commission on Prisoners of War: 3d Session	Geneva	Aug. 25-
4th Meeting of the International Whaling Commission	London	June 3-
International Meeting of Tonnage Measurement Experts	The Hague	June 4-
ILO (International Labor Organization):		
35th Session of the International Labor Conference	Geneva	June 4-
21st Session of the International Criminal Police Commission	Stockholm	June 9-
PICMME (Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe):		
3d Session	Washington	June 10-
Annual Meeting of the Directing Council of the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood	Montevideo	June 13-
26th Art Biennial	Venice	June 14-
Committee on Highway Programming and Planning	Washington	June 23-
International Philatelic Exhibition	Utrecht	June 28-
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
4th Special Meeting of Rules of the Air and Air Traffic Services Committee (European/Mediterranean Region)	Paris	June 30-
Aeronautical Information Services Division Meeting	Montreal	Aug. 19-
2d Meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries	St. Andrews, New Brunswick	June 30-
15th International Conference on Public Education	Geneva	July 7-
2d International Congress of Physiology and Pathology of Animal Reproduction and Artificial Insemination	Copenhagen	July 7-
6th International Congress for Animal Husbandry	Copenhagen	July 9-
UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization):		
Seminar on Workers' Education (International Center for Adult Education)	Paris	July 12-
International Conference on Copyright	Geneva	Aug. 18-
WMO (World Meteorological Organization):		
Meeting of Commission for Maritime Meteorology	London	July 14-
International Conference on Soil Fertility	Dublin	July 21-
18th International Red Cross Conference	Toronto	July 23-
Pan American Institute of Geography and History:		
3d Consultation on Geography	Washington	July 25-
Inter-American Seminar on Vocational Education	University of Maryland, College Park, Md.	Aug. 2-
2d International Congress on Analytical Chemistry	Oxford, England	Aug. 4-
13th International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art	Venice	Aug. 8-
8th General Assembly of the International Geographical Union	Washington	Aug. 8-

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled June 1–August 31, 1952—Continued

10th General Assembly of the International Radio Scientific Union . . .	Sydney, Australia	Aug. 11–
8th International Conference of Agricultural Economists	East Lansing, Mich	Aug. 15–
6th International Edinburgh Film Festival	Edinburgh	Aug. 17–
6th International Grassland Congress	Pennsylvania State College, Pa.	Aug. 17–
4th International Congress of Onomastic Sciences	Uppsala, Sweden	Aug. 18–
2d General Assembly of the International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics	Istanbul	Aug. 25–
8th General Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women . .	Rio de Janeiro	July or August
International Sugar Council	London	July or August

The International Mathematical Union and Its Work

REPORT OF THE FIRST SESSION HELD AT ROME, MARCH 6–8, 1952

by Marshall H. Stone

The new International Mathematical Union held its first General Assembly at Rome, March 6–8, 1952. The Assembly planned its activities up to the time of its next meeting, to be held in the Netherlands in 1954 in connection with the next International Congress of Mathematicians. The Assembly also elected officers of the Union, as follows: President, M. H. Stone (U.S.); First Vice President, E. Borel (France); Second Vice President, E. Kamke (Federal Republic of Germany); Secretary, E. Bompiani (Italy); and elected members of the Executive Committee, W. V. D. Hodge (U.K.), S. Iyanaga (Japan), and B. Jessen (Denmark).

The following 22 countries are now members of the Union: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, the United States, and Yugoslavia. With the exception of Argentina, Canada, Cuba, and Pakistan, all these countries were represented at the Rome meeting. An application from Sweden for membership in the Union is now pending. The General Assembly was attended also by observers from Poland and Portugal. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Council of Scientific Unions sent representatives who participated in the work of the Assembly.

The function of the International Mathematical

Union is to promote international cooperation and activities which favor the development of mathematics. The valuable work done by national mathematical organizations (such as the American Mathematical Society, the Mathematical Association of America, the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, the Association for Symbolic Logic, and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, to name the principal American mathematical organizations) needs to be supplemented and coordinated by an international organization in which common problems can be discussed and attacked for the common benefit. Among such problems are the facilitation of international travel by mathematicians (student mathematicians included) for scientific purposes; the organization of general and special scientific meetings of an international character, like the International Congress of Mathematicians (which has been held, except for interruptions due to World Wars I and II, at intervals of approximately 4 years since 1893); the solution of financial and technical difficulties obstructing the prompt publication and universal dissemination of mathematical discoveries and ideas; and the many problems arising from the need for teaching more mathematics to more young people in a world where science and technology are accelerating the already rapid changes in our old ways of life.

The Union will accept the adherence of any country which is mathematically active and which applies for membership in one of the five groups

described in the statutes. The Union, moreover, will continue to urge the adherence of all mathematically active countries which are not yet members. It is also very encouraging that, as the U.S. delegation to the recent General Assembly has reported, the work of the Union has begun in a cordial spirit, permitting the Union to combine the best features of the various related proposals put forward in the debate on its program.

In the experience of mathematicians, personal associations through correspondence and at individual or group meetings are most fruitful for the development of mathematics. The discussion of current research and the exchange of ideas about mathematical problems under independent study by a number of different investigators are stimulating and helpful to a very significant degree. The Union believes that it can augment the opportunities for fruitful associations by publishing both a world directory of active mathematicians and a regular bulletin covering the news of current mathematical publications, international mathematical meetings, and individual travel by mathematicians. A committee is making plans for these publications.

Work of the International Commission

One of the most significant tasks to be undertaken by the Union will be the continuation and expansion of the work begun a number of years ago by the International Commission of Mathematical Instruction. This Commission proposed to the General Assembly that it be reconstituted as a Committee of the Union. At the Rome meeting the Assembly acted favorably on this proposal, and the Committee is now being organized. The problems of instruction which await consideration by the Committee are of wide variety. For example, the coming decades will see the establishment of systems of mass education in many countries where schooling has in the past been restricted to a fortunate few. The place of mathematical instruction in these new educational systems must be determined with attention to the requirements of the modern industrial society, which is displacing the older agricultural forms of social organization throughout the world.

If democracy is to have any meaning in a complex industrial society, the people must know enough of mathematics to grasp the essentials of social security programs, taxation, crop controls, wage and price controls, and other features of governmental relations to the individual citizen which involve mathematical concepts and techniques. At the same time many trades and industrial activities demand mathematical skills above the level of mere mathematical literacy, and failure to provide for the acquisition of those skills within the system of mass education means the denial of opportunity to many a young man or woman starting out in life.

The problem of determining the place of mathematics cannot be divorced from technical considerations concerning teaching methods. If we judge by the results, we must find it difficult to escape from the conclusion that our attempts to teach mathematics as part of a program of mass education have so far been, to put it bluntly, a colossal failure, traceable to our ignorance and complacency in respect to the art of teaching.

No less important than elementary mathematical instruction is the training of young scientists, including mathematicians, in the various branches of mathematics basic to scientific understanding and research. The student of man and his behavior, whether individual or social, stands increasingly in need of mathematical tools and the ability to use them. Thus, the problem of higher instruction in mathematics has to be examined in the light of the social scientist's needs quite as much as those of the natural scientist and engineer. The Committee on Mathematical Instruction can perform a valuable service by stressing the importance of this problem, as well as by stimulating the study of teaching methods and the preparation of teaching materials, particularly textbooks.

Role of Mathematics in our Society

Whatever the Union may be able to do on behalf of progress in mathematics affects interests far wider than the obvious ones of the mathematical profession itself, because mathematics plays a vital role in the growth of our industrial civilization. Indeed, the capacity for national growth and development can be gauged rather accurately by the quality and extent of the national activity in mathematics. Advances in mathematical research are essential to advances in pure science, and hence to advances in technology.

Although the International Mathematical Union already has more than a score of member countries, its resources are limited and it must commence its work on a modest scale. By keeping the initial outlays at a minimum, the Union will be able to build up a small reserve fund, essential to its financial security. The Union hopes that the nature of its work may inspire the good will and the generosity of individuals and organizations both within and without the mathematical profession. It believes that some of its activities would be of interest to UNESCO—particularly that part of the work of the Committee on Mathematical Instruction which deals with mathematical literacy and secondary mathematics teaching.

In each country which adheres to the Union, a National Committee for Mathematics has been formed as the adhering organization for that country. In the United States the National Committee is a committee of the Division of Mathematics of the National Research Council, the adhering organization for the United States being the National Academy of Sciences-National Research

Council. These National Committees for Mathematics will give continuing attention to relations between the Union and the adhering organizations. They can actively promote the work of the Union both by interpreting it to the people of their respective countries and by soliciting support for it from both governmental and private agencies. Above all, they can contribute strength to the Union by maintaining close contacts be-

tween the Union and the members of the mathematical profession in the various adhering countries.

• *Mr. Stone, author of the above article, is chairman of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Chicago. Mr. Stone was chairman of the U.S. delegation to the March session of IMU.*

U.S. Denies Holding "Cartel" Position on Control of Atomic Energy

*by Ambassador Benjamin V. Cohen
Deputy U. S. Representative to the United Nations¹*

Now because Mr. Malik has spoken in such misleading terms about the U.N. plan, without holding that it is sacrosanct, I am forced to explain some of the facts about the plan which Mr. Malik constantly misrepresents.²

The term "ownership" as used in the U.N. plan for the control of atomic energy does not contemplate any supermonopoly on a commercial basis. It has nothing to do with private profits. It does not contemplate strict control by U.S. capitalists.

It does contemplate a multilateral plan, an international plan. If such an international plan can be branded as an American-controlled scheme, I am forced to repeat what I have asked Mr. Malik before: Is there any form of international control, that is not subject to the Soviet veto, which will not be branded when it suits the Soviet purpose, as American controlled rather than international controlled?

If we cannot agree on a multilateral international control plan without veto, then any effective international control is excluded. Whether it is the U.N. plan or any other plan, we believe that we must agree on an independent international

control, but if we are going to agree on it, it must not be subject to veto and it must not be branded in advance as a plan controlled by American mechanical majority.

The sole object of the United States in relation to atomic energy is to insure prohibition, in practice, of atomic weapons and to insure the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

All that Mr. Malik says about our avoiding the prohibition of atomic weapons is a misrepresentation. Our concern is to find effective means; not a prohibiting on paper but eliminating of atomic weapons in practice.

As to the safeguards necessary to assure such a result, we do not care whether they are described as "ownership" or as "control." The important point is that we have those safeguards.

Safeguards in the Field of Atomic Energy

Let us review briefly the safeguards, avoiding the use of the controversial word "ownership." They are all set up in the second report of the Atomic Energy Commission, part of which I am paraphrasing. They were discussed in detail in the United Nations in 1947 and 1948. Sufficient time has elapsed so that I think it would be profitable to everyone if we review those principles and the reasons for them.

The central fact to remember is that large-scale development of atomic energy automatically and inevitably results in the production of nuclear fuel. Such fuel can be used in weapons with

¹ Excerpts from a statement made before Committee I of the Disarmament Commission on May 14 and released to the press by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. on the same date.

² Yakov Malik is the Soviet representative on the Disarmament Commission.

For text of the General Assembly's resolution on atomic energy control, as adopted Nov. 4, 1948, see BULLETIN of Nov. 14, 1948, p. 606.

a relatively small effort and requiring small installations. For this reason, the broad purposes of safeguards in the field of atomic energy was in the interest of international security to prevent nuclear fuel in dangerous quantities being accumulated or seized by any nation.

The international control agency created to insure this general objective and to insure the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only would have the following four specific objectives under the U.N. plan.

1. To give the international control agency the means of preventing preparations for atomic warfare.
2. To lessen the possibility of one nation, or group of nations, achieving potential supremacy in the field of atomic energy.
3. To give warning to complying nations of any breach of the treaty.
4. To dispel suspicions and false accusations.

The United Nations Atomic Energy Commission determined that in order for the control agency to accomplish these objectives it must have a measure of control over source material, nuclear fuels, and dangerous facilities which it frequently described as ownership by the international agency. The meaning of that word agency, as used by the Atomic Energy Commission, can briefly be described as follows, paraphrasing the second report of the Commission:

The studies of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission established the necessity for international control and allocation of the quantities of uranium and thorium which are to be separated from their place in nature, the time and place of the further processing and purification of source materials, and the size, use, and disposition of working stocks and stocks in transit. Without such comprehensive international control of the flow of source materials from the first point where they are capable of being diverted, there would be serious risk of the diversion of source material or of the accumulation of stocks with a view to subsequent dispersion or seizure.

The basic policies and provisions governing the exercise of this international control and direction must be specified in the treaty or convention and implemented by the international agency to administer these controls effectively. The international agency, acting as trustee for all the signatory nations jointly in accordance with the policies set forth in the treaty or convention, must be given indisputable control of the source materials promptly after their separation from their natural deposits. International security requires that there be no doubt that within the terms of the treaty or convention the right of decision in regard to the disposition of this material must lie with the international agency. Therefore, no nation or person has any right in any circumstances to dispose of or to possess these materials or facilities.

Authority of the U. N. Atomic Energy Commission

It will be seen that the agency's authority with respect to source materials or nuclear fuels includes the exclusive right to move or lease the material, the right to use and produce energy from them, and the same rights for all production formed from them. No disposition of material can be made without the permission of the agency.

It is proposed that the agency should acquire for a price to be agreed the source material from the time it is removed from the place of deposit in nature or, in the case of source material containing other constituents, from the time those constituents had been extracted. The agency will not be permitted to sell these materials but could lease them for authorized uses.

Likewise, the agency's authority with respect to dangerous facilities includes the right of the agency to make decisions regarding their allocation, construction, and operation within the terms of the treaty or convention. The useful and non-dangerous production of these plants would be made available to the nations under fair and equitable arrangements. The location and type within a nation will be decided by agreement with the nation concerned.

The agency's authority over facilities within a nation includes the right of possession, operation, and disposition subject to the terms of the treaty or convention. The agency could not sell dangerous facilities. The agency's authority over a power plant would not include the right to shut down a plant at will. It does include responsibility to operate facilities in such a way as to not endanger health and the responsibility for any damage.

While vesting ownership in the agency in the sense of a trust exercised on behalf of the signatory states jointly in order that the agency should have the final right of decision in regard to the disposition of source materials, nuclear fuels, and the operation of dangerous facilities, it was also realized that the nations could not be expected to give unlimited discretionary powers to the international agency. The plan, therefore, set out in detail the provisions which are to govern the location, mining production, distribution, and use of source material and nuclear fuel, as well as dangerous facilities. It would then be the duty and responsibility of the international agency to implement these provisions in accordance with the terms of the treaty.

I wish to emphasize that under this U.N. plan the powers, rights, and functions of both the international control agency and of the signatory nations are spelled out in great detail. The agency is, under the provisions of the treaty establishing international control, in fact, the servant and not the master of the signatory nations. These provisions are very carefully spelled out in the U.N.

plan. No nation is asked to buy a pig in a poke or to submit itself to any American cartel.

It was recognized that the treaty or convention which would put such a system into effect cannot cover all the situations that might arise between the signatory states and the agency. However, whatever legal issues might arise in this connection, nations cannot have any proprietary rights or rights to decision arising therefrom over source materials, nuclear fuels, or dangerous facilities located within their territory. Such restrictions are not in order to give private profits to any cartel. Such restrictions are intended to insure the prohibition of atomic weapons.

The agency would also have certain authority with respect to the detection of secret activities and with respect to research which are intimately linked in the functions that have been described.

Prevention and Detection of Secret Activities

With regard to the prevention and detection of secret activities, the essential thing is that all activities and facilities in the field of atomic energy must either be managed or licensed by the agency. Once this is provided, then the agency in the detection of clandestine activities need not be concerned with the motives of those carrying on unauthorized activities in this field, for it is the very existence of such activities that is illegal.

With regard to research, the agency should have positive research and development responsibility in order to remain in the forefront of atomic knowledge so as to render the agency more effective in promoting the beneficial use of atomic energy and in eliminating its destructive ones.

In this statement I have paraphrased some of the functions of the international agency concerned with atomic energy as set forth in the U.N. plan. I am assured by those with technical competence that in order to insure the elimination of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, the international agency should have the authority set forth in the plan, and no less authority.

It makes no difference to my government, however, whether authority of this nature is described as "ownership" or as "control." It is the authority itself, and not the words describing it with which we are concerned. We are concerned with the elimination of atomic weapons and therefore with the creation of a system which will produce that result.

Soviets Asked To Present Realistic Proposals

It was the view of the United Nations that the proposals made by the Soviet Union in 1947 would not produce that result. When the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union in the past General Assembly stated that the Soviet Union had new and

additional proposals,³ we welcomed his initiative. We are waiting to receive those proposals. To date, however, we have received nothing that goes beyond the inadequate proposals of 1947 or, if the new proposals are intended to go beyond that, we have not been given the information necessary to enable us to see that fact. Indeed, we are uncertain whether the Soviet Union is advocating even the unsatisfactory measure of international control which it proposed in 1947. In fact, it is not clear to us that the Soviet Union may not have retreated from those proposals in that it now maintains that the international control organ is not entitled to interfere in the domestic affairs of states in the exercise of its functions.

We must, therefore, again ask the Soviet representative these all important questions: What authority in addition to those enumerated in the Soviet proposal of 1947 would be granted to the international agency under their new suggestions? What safeguards, if any, does the Soviet Union propose beyond those set forth in the 1947 proposal? We would deeply appreciate answers to those questions.

It is no good for the Soviet representative to go on saying that all will be well if we simply take a decision in principle on prohibition and the establishment of a control system. Perhaps he will recall the old Russian proverb: "If you tell a man long enough he is a pig, he will begin to grunt."

As I have said, the control system proposed by the Soviet Union so far as it has been explained to us is inadequate and not acceptable, but if there are additional facts that we have not been enlightened on, we will consider them with an open mind. Our desire is to find an effective system.

Even if the Soviet proposals provided an adequate system, even if we were to all agree on precisely what the control system should be, then the question remains, what would be the practical effect of taking a decision in principle on prohibition? The Soviet representative says that the prohibition would not go into effect until the control system went into effect. If that is the case, why does the Soviet Union want a decision, an immediate decision in principle on prohibition now?

It would seem more sensible and realistic to work out the details of a control system which would put into effective operation the system and would really prohibit the atomic bomb. That would be something more than a promise or a decision in principle. That would be the real elimination of atomic weapons. If we could agree on that, we could all work together in using atomic energy for the betterment of mankind.

What we need here in order to make progress is some indication from the Soviet representative

³ For text of a press conference statement by Secretary Acheson on the "new" Soviet disarmament proposal, together with the text of that proposal, see *ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1952, p. 126.

that his Government is prepared to agree and to discuss sensible and realistic proposals.

We still await the answers to the questions put to the Soviet representative by several of our colleagues here in previous sessions and at this session. The Soviet representative has still not explained precisely how his Government visualized the process of inspection on a continuing basis. He has not explained precisely what his Government means by saying that this inspection, although on a continuing basis, should not interfere in the domestic affairs of states. He has not explained how an inspection system alone will suffice to insure that atomic weapons will be effectively prohibited.

I know that we have translation difficulties.

The English word "control" has connotations in Russian different from what it means to us. Perhaps our discussion would go more profitably if we left aside these difficult words for a time and talked in specific terms of operation—what would be done; who would do it; and how it would be done.

I can assure the Soviet representative that if he is able to make specific and detailed proposals in these terms, my Government will examine them with great care and with an open mind. We do not really care so much about what words are used. What we care about is establishing an international system which will make sure that weapons of mass destruction are not used, that great armies no longer threaten the peace.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Fourteenth Session of ECOSOC

On May 20 the Department of State announced that Isador Lubin, U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (Ecosoc), will attend the fourteenth session of the Council, which will convene on May 20 at U.N. Headquarters, New York. Mr. Lubin and the deputy U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council, Walter M. Kotschnig, Director, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, will be assisted by the following other members of the U.S. delegation:

Advisers

Robert E. Asher, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State
Kathleen Bell, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State
Katherine G. Heath, Office of International Relations, Federal Security Agency
Frances Kernohan, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State
Joseph C. McCaskill, Director, Division of International Activities, Department of the Interior
Forrest Murden, United States Mission to the United Nations, New York
Walter Salant, Council of Economic Advisers, Executive Office of the President
William J. Stibravy, Special Assistant to the Director, Office of Financial and Development Policy, Department of State
Virginia C. Westfall, Division of International Administration, Department of State
Ayrness Joy Wickens, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor

Ad Hoc Advisers

Herbert Block, Division of Research for U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, Department of State

Joseph D. Coppock, Adviser, Office of Economic Defense Trade Policy, Department of State
Eleanor E. Dennison, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State
James F. Green, Deputy Director, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State

Press Officer

Gilbert W. Stewart, United States Mission to the United Nations, New York

Administrative Assistant

Marie Florence Rodgers, United States Mission to the United Nations, New York

The Economic and Social Council is responsible for making or initiating studies and reports concerning international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters; for the promotion of respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms; and for making recommendations with respect to any such matters to the General Assembly of the United Nations, to the members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.

Among the 46 items on the provisional agenda for the fourteenth session of the Council are consideration of the world economic situation; programs of technical assistance; methods of financing the economic development of underdeveloped countries; international cooperation on water control and utilization; development of arid lands; social activities; freedom of information; prevention of discrimination to minorities; refugees and stateless persons; narcotic drugs; critical shortage of insecticides for public-health purposes; relief and rehabilitation of Korea; applications of nongovernmental organizations for

consultative status; and coordination of the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

The Council will also review the reports of all of its functional and regional commissions, as well as the reports of a number of the specialized agencies, including the International Labor Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, International Telecommunication Union, and World Health Organization.

The Economic and Social Council is composed of one representative from each of the 18 member states, six countries being elected each year by the General Assembly to serve for a period of 3 years. The member states at the present time are Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay.

The thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council was held at Geneva, July 30–September 21, 1951, and at Paris, December 18–21, 1951.

Planning Board for Ocean Shipping

On May 12 the Department of State announced that the U.S. delegation to the fourth session of the North Atlantic Planning Board for Ocean Shipping, which convenes on that date at Washington, D.C., is as follows:

United States Representative

Huntington T. Morse, Special Assistant to the Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce

Alternate United States Representative

John W. Mann, Attaché, American Embassy, London

Advisers

Charles M. Clark, Jr., Consultant to the Chairman of the Munitions Board, Department of Defense

Lester M. Haddad, Management Engineer, Defense Management Committee, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense

Serge Koushnareff, Deputy Director, Transport and Communications Division, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce

Charles H. McGuire, Director, National Shipping Authority, Department of Commerce

Lehman P. Nickell, Shipping Policy Staff, Department of State

Capt. Herman E. Schieke, U.S.N., Joint Military Transportation Committee Member, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense

James W. Swihart, Office of European Regional Affairs, Department of State

The Planning Board, composed of all countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, was established by the fourth session of the North Atlantic Treaty Council in furtherance of article 9 of the treaty. The Board reports to the Council and works in close cooperation with other bodies of the treaty organization in all matters relating to merchant shipping in defense planning.

Current United Nations Documents A Selected Bibliography¹

Economic and Social Council

Report of the Universal Postal Union. E/2179, February 27, 1952. 77 pp. mimeo.

Narcotic Drugs. International Limitation of Opium Production. E/2186/Add.1, April 9, 1952. 5 pp. mimeo.

Report of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. E/2195, April 7, 1952. 26 pp. mimeo.

Report of the World Meteorological Organization. E/2196, April 7, 1952. 38 pp. mimeo.

World Conference on Population. Report by the Secretary-General. E/2199, April 9, 1952. 18 pp. mimeo.

Non-Governmental Organizations. Report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. Applications and Re-Applications for Consultative Status. E/2201, April 24, 1952. 7 pp. mimeo.

Co-ordination of the Work of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. Eleventh Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to the Economic and Social Council. E/2203, April 14, 1952. 27 pp. mimeo.

Communications Concerning Human Rights. Note by the Secretary-General. E/2206, April 14, 1952. 7 pp. mimeo.

Inter-Agency Agreements and Agreements Between Agencies and Other Inter-Governmental Organizations. Draft Agreement Between the Organization of American States and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. E/2210, April 21, 1952. 6 pp. mimeo.

Amendments of the Rules of Procedure of the Council. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. E/2212, April 25, 1952. 12 pp. mimeo.

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. Annexes to the Report of the Governing Body. E/ICEF/187/Add.1, March 15, 1952. 54 pp. mimeo. Also General Progress Report of the Executive Director. E/ICEF/190/Add.1, April 22, 1952. 5 pp. mimeo.

Also Statement by Mr. Keeny, Director of UNICEF Asia Regional Office, Bangkok, to Programme Committee, United Nations Headquarters, April 19, 1952. E/ICEF/194, April 19, 1952. 8 pp. mimeo.

Also Statement by Mr. Egger, Paris Office. Development of UNICEF Assistance to Countries in Africa. E/ICEF/195, April 21, 1952. 6 pp. mimeo.

Also Report of the Board of Auditors to the General Assembly on the Audits of the Accounts of the Fund for the year ended December 31, 1951. E/ICEF/196, April 22, 1952. 9 pp. mimeo.

The Problem of Statelessness. Information transmitted by States in pursuance of Economic and Social Council resolution 352 (XII) relating to the problem of statelessness. E/2164/Add.22, April 21, 1952. 5 pp. mimeo.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

The United Nations Secretariat has established an *Official Records* series for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Atomic Energy Commission which includes summaries of proceedings, resolutions, and reports of the various commissions and committees. Information on securing subscriptions to the series may be obtained from the International Documents Service.

The United States in the United Nations

[May 16-May 29, 1952]

General Assembly

Collective Measures Committee (CMC)—On May 15 the Committee approved the report of its subcommittee on the future program of work of the CMC. The subcommittee was instructed to draft two letters to member states: One, requesting suggestions and ideas as to topics which warrant further study in 1952; the second, requesting information regarding the implementation of recommendations contained in General Assembly Resolution 503 (VI) of January 12, 1952.

At the CMC meeting, the chairman, Joao Carlos Muniz (Brazil), stated that the first report of the Committee, which was submitted to the sixth General Assembly, represented

an invaluable first step forward in the field of collective security under the Charter, inasmuch as it constituted a study, an analysis, an exploration of collective means of defense and coordinated action by nations determined to defend the purposes and principles of the Charter and resolved not to recognize the use of force or threat of force as a valid means for the prosecution of political objectives.

The Collective Measures Committee also established two subcommittees, one for the consideration of economic and financial measures, and one on military measures.

Economic and Social Council

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)—The Council began its 12-week fourteenth session at United Nations Headquarters on May 20 and elected S. Amjad Ali (Pakistan) as President for 1952. By a vote of 14-4 (Soviet bloc, Sweden)-0, the Council adopted the United States proposal to adjourn debate for the session on the Soviet motion to unseat the Chinese National representative.

After consideration and adoption of the agenda, the Council decided to transmit, without discussion, the item on "Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights" relating to countries which are members of the International Labor Organization (ILO) to that Organization. Only allegations relating to countries not members of ILO will be discussed by the Council. All recommendations of the Non-Governmental Committee on applications for consultative status with the Council, excepting two organizations, were approved. Three separate resolutions were adopted

in which the Council stated it had no objections to the applications of Spain, Nepal, and Libya for membership in UNESCO.

The narcotic drugs agenda item was discussed, including the reports of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and of the Permanent Central Opium Board. A joint Belgium-Egypt-France-U.S. resolution calling for the convening of an international conference to prepare and adopt a protocol on the limitation of opium production was adopted by a vote of 13-3 (Soviet bloc)-2 (Pakistan, U.K.). An amended Belgium-French-U.S. resolution urging governments of opium and coca-leaf producing countries to take effective measures immediately to prevent such production from entering the illicit market was adopted by a vote of 17-0-1 (Iran).

The Council completed discussion of the report of the sixth session of the Commission on the Status of Women and adopted, *inter alia*, the amended draft Convention on Political Rights of Women by a vote of 11-0-6 (Canada, Egypt, Soviet bloc, U.K.); a resolution on equal pay for equal work (11 (U.S.)-0-6); and a resolution calling for annual meetings of the Commission.

Commission on Human Rights—With the adoption of the following additional articles, the Commission completed action on the articles to be included in the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights:

1. An article proposed by the United States which recognizes the right of everyone: (a) To take part in cultural life; (b) To enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications. . . . The vote was 14-0-3 (Soviet bloc).

2. An article on the right of everyone to adequate food, clothing, and housing was approved 14-0-4 (Soviet bloc, U.K.).

3. An article calling for free compulsory primary education was adopted by a vote of 12-5 (U.S., Australia, Belgium, Sweden, U.K.)-1 (India).

4. An article, adopted unanimously, recognizing the right of everyone to an "adequate standard of living and the continuous improvement of living conditions."

5. An article "recognizing the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health" was approved 15-0-3 (Poland, U.S.S.R., U.K.).

6. An article on the protection of mothers and children was adopted, 15-0-3 (Australia, Sweden, U.K.).

7. An article "to ensure the free exercise of the right of everyone to form and join local, national and international trade unions of his choice for the protection of his economic and social interests" was adopted by a vote of 12-2 (Uruguay, Chile)-4 Soviet bloc, Yugoslavia.

8. An article to "ensure the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all economic, social and cultural rights set forth in this Covenant" was approved 10-3 (U.S., Sweden, U.K.)-5 (Australia, Belgium, China, France, India).

9. A French-Chilean draft article on the non-abridgement of existing rights and freedoms was adopted by a vote of 13-0-5 (Australia, U.K., Soviet bloc).

10. The last article, "general limitations clause," was adopted by a vote of 10-6 (Soviet bloc, Yugoslavia, Lebanon, Chile)-2 (Egypt, Pakistan).

Social Commission—The Commission, during its 3-week session, *inter alia*, took the following action:

1. It unanimously approved the 12 conclusions and recommendations on the needs of children deprived of a normal home life, on the aid that should be provided by governments and other agencies, and on United Nations readiness to help develop the necessary services.

2. The Commission adopted a resolution calling for further development of child-welfare programs both by governments and by the United Nations.

3. It adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary-General to continue to emphasize the advisory social-welfare services and to "carry out the program in accordance with General Assembly Resolution 418(V) and with due observance to the comments and points of view expressed by the Social Commission at its eighth session."

4. A resolution was approved calling for the simplification of formalities and reduction of costs for migrants.

5. It adopted a resolution recommending that the Economic and Social Council and the Secretary-General explore the problems concerned in financing, housing and community development from external sources, with particular attention to the needs of low-income groups, underdeveloped areas, and countries whose housing facilities have deteriorated owing to war destruction.

6. It adopted a 5-principle resolution on in-service training of social welfare personnel, recommending that "training for social welfare should take as many forms as are appropriate to the needs of the people of the various countries."

7. A resolution was adopted on the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped stating, in part, that all appropriate steps should be taken . . . to intensify and expand the giving of direct assistance to the

governments of under-developed countries in order to help them to assess their problems and work out a realistic program in the field of rehabilitation including a program for the prevention of blindness and the welfare of the blind. . . .

8. The Commission took note of the 420-page "Preliminary Report on the World Social Situation" and recommended

that such a report should be drawn up every four years, and that a document relating to international and governmental programs of technical assistance in social development should also be prepared quadrennially by the Secretariat, two years after each report on the social situation has appeared. . . .

Security Council

Disarmament Commission—On May 28 the United States, United Kingdom, and France submitted a working paper on the Numerical Limitations of All Armed Forces. The paper proposes:

. . . that the maximum ceilings for the U.S.S.R., the United States and China should be the same and fixed at, say, between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000 and the maximum ceilings for the United Kingdom and France should be the same and fixed at, say, between 700,000 and 800,000.

For all other states having substantial armed forces there should be agreed maximum ceilings fixed in relation to the ceilings agreed upon for the Five Powers. Such ceilings should be fixed with a view to avoiding a disequilibrium of power dangerous to international peace and security in any area of the world and thus reducing the danger of war. The ceilings would normally be less than one percent of the population. Moreover, they should be less than current levels except in very special circumstances.

Sir Gladwyn Jebb (U.K.), in introducing these proposals, observed that they were much more drastic and far superior to the Soviet plan for a one-third reduction of the armed forces of the great powers; they provided for fixed ceilings which were in balance.

In his statement, Benjamin V. Cohen (U.S.) pointed out that

The proposals which the French, the British and the American delegations have submitted to the Commission deal with one of the essential parts—and in some ways the most important part—of a comprehensive disarmament program. Our proposals are flexible, they are not intended to be final or exhaustive. The reductions for the United States and, we assume, for the U.S.S.R. and China would be well over 50 percent.

. . . Limiting the numbers of permitted armed forces is only a part of our task. We must also limit the types and quantities of armaments which should be allowed to support permitted armed forces. . . .

Mr. Cohen also noted:

Of course, the proposed reductions in armed forces depends upon the settlement of the Korean conflict and some progress towards the establishment of peaceful conditions throughout the world.

The Commission approved (11-1) (U.S.S.R.) its first report to the Security Council and the General Assembly, which includes the above proposals.

Status of Lend-Lease Negotiations with U.S.S.R.

*Following is the text of a letter from Senator William F. Knowland of California to Secretary Acheson concerning vessels loaned by the United States to the Soviet Union under the Lend-Lease Act and the Master Lend-Lease Agreement, and of the reply sent by Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations:*¹

APRIL 10, 1952.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During World War II the United States Government made available to the U.S.S.R. several ships under the provision of the lend-lease law.

Would you advise me of the number of ships by type, that were made available and their approximate value. I would also like to know the number of ships which have been returned to the custody of the United States by Russia, indicating their type and original value. Could you also advise me what steps this country has taken in order to repossess those ships which have not been returned to us.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

APRIL 24, 1952.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Reference is made to your letter of April 10, requesting information concerning vessels transferred to the Government of the U.S.S.R. under lend-lease and the efforts of this Government to obtain their return, and to Mr. Katz' acknowledgment of your letter by telephone on April 14.

During World War II, the Government of the

United States transferred to the Government of the U.S.S.R. under lend-lease 121 merchant vessels, 585 naval craft, and 29 small Army watercraft. These vessels were procured from appropriations made to the Maritime Commission, the Navy Department, and the War Department, respectively. Of the merchant vessels, 21 were returned and 4 were lost prior to the end of the war, and 9 other vessels were returned after the end of the war. A total of 30 naval craft have been returned, all after the end of the war, and 1 naval vessel has been certified as lost. None of the Army watercraft have been returned. The attached tables show the number of vessels transferred to the Government of the U.S.S.R. and those returned, by types, as well as the approximate cost of the vessels to the Government of the United States at the time of transfer.

From the outset of the lend-lease settlement negotiations with the Government of the U.S.S.R., which began in April 1947, the Department has constantly reminded the Government of the U.S.S.R. of its obligations under article V of the master lend-lease agreement of June 11, 1942, to return to the United States lend-lease articles determined by the President to be of use to the United States. The return of 3 icebreakers was requested in July 1946 and the return of 28 frigates was requested in January 1948. On October 7, 1948, the demand for the return of these vessels under article V was reiterated and, in addition, the return of 186 other naval craft was demanded. The designated vessels were those considered at that time to be of immediate importance to the United States. The Government of the United States had previously stated its willingness to discuss the sale to the Government of the U.S.S.R. of the remaining naval craft, provided there was a prompt and satisfactory over-all lend-lease settlement.

¹ Printed from *Cong. Rec.* of May 7, 1952, p. 4961.

TABLE I.—*Information on merchant vessels transferred to the U. S. S. R. under lend-lease*

Type	Transferred	Value ¹	Returned prior to VJ-day	Value ¹	Lost prior to VJ-day	Value ¹	In Soviet custody on VJ-day	Value ¹	Returned subsequent to VJ-day	Value ¹	Presently in Soviet custody	Value ¹
War-built Liberty ships, dry cargo.....	38	65, 686	1	1, 729	1	1, 729	36	62, 229	0	-----	36	62, 229
Liberty tankers.....	3	5, 186	0	-----	0	-----	3	5, 186	3	5, 186	0	-----
T-2 tankers.....	5	16, 000	0	-----	0	-----	5	16, 000	² 5	16, 000	0	-----
War-built tugs.....	2	1, 235	0	-----	0	-----	2	1, 235	0	-----	2	1, 235
Prewar-built ships, dry cargo.....	60	28, 728	10	5, 329	2	1, 915	48	21, 983	³ 1	500	47	21, 483
Prewar-built tankers.....	12	8, 946	10	7, 295	1	788	1	863	0	-----	1	863
Prewar-built tug.....	1	140	0	-----	0	-----	1	140	0	-----	1	140
Total.....	121	125, 921	21	14, 353	4	4, 432	96	107, 636	9	21, 686	87	85, 940

¹ Cost to the U. S. Government at time of acquisition (\$000).

² 1 broken in half; both halves salvaged and returned to the United States.

³ Returned to the United States and transferred to Italy from which country originally seized by the United States in World War II.

After further delays, the Government of the U.S.S.R. in August 1949 finally appointed naval experts to discuss the details of return of the 3 icebreakers and 28 frigates, as well as the disposition of the remaining naval craft. On September 27, 1949, an agreement was signed concerning the dates and procedures for the return of 3 icebreakers and 27 frigates, 1 frigate having been certified by the Government of the U.S.S.R. as lost.

It had been the understanding of the Department that the Soviet naval experts had been appointed to discuss the return of all 217 naval vessels demanded on October 7, 1948, as well as the disposition of remaining naval vessels, and immediately following the agreement on the icebreakers and frigates the Soviet representatives were asked to continue discussions. However, without any prior indication to the Department of State, the Soviet naval experts suddenly departed for the U.S.S.R.

In accordance with the agreement of September 27, 1949, the Government of the U.S.S.R. returned the 27 frigates and 1 icebreaker, in the fall of 1949. The 2 remaining icebreakers, however, were not returned until December 1951, the Government of the U.S.S.R. claiming that they were caught in the Arctic ice for some 2 years.

As regards the merchant vessels, the Government of the United States on December 11, 1947, requested the return of one dry cargo vessel, three Liberty tankers and four T-2 tankers. These vessels were returned by the Government of the U.S.S.R. in March 1948. One additional tanker broke in half, however, both halves were salvaged and were returned to the United States. The Government of the United States agreed to transfer title to the remaining vessels to the Gov-

ernment of the U.S.S.R. on agreed terms provided there was a prompt and satisfactory over-all lend-lease settlement.

On January 27, 1951, at a meeting between representatives of the Government of the United States and the Government of the U.S.S.R., Ambassador John C. Wiley, on instruction from the President, demanded the immediate return of all naval and merchant vessels, and Army watercraft. This demand was formally confirmed on February 7, 1951, by a note from the Secretary of State to Mr. Panyushkin, the Soviet Ambassador.² As of possible interest to you I am attaching a copy of this note as well as copies of the notes of the Government of the U.S.S.R. of March 21³ and August 21, 1951,⁴ and the notes of this Government of April 6,⁵ July 2,⁶ 1951, and January 7, 1952.⁷

As will be seen, the replies of the Government of the U.S.S.R. were completely unsatisfactory. The note of the Government of the United States of January 7, accordingly, requests the Government of the U.S.S.R. immediately either to make arrangements for the return of all the lend-lease vessels or agree to submit the problem to the International Court of Justice for adjudication.

It is the intention of the Department to continue to press vigorously for the return from the U.S.S.R. of all the lend-lease vessels.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

² BULLETIN of Feb. 19, 1951, p. 302.

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 23, 1951, p. 647.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Jan. 21, 1952, p. 87.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Apr. 23, 1951, p. 646.

⁶ *Ibid.*, July 23, 1951, p. 145.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Jan. 21, 1952, p. 86.

TABLE II.—*Information on Naval and Army watercraft transferred to the U. S. S. R. under lend-lease*

	Transferred	Value ¹	Returned	Value ¹
NAVAL VESSELS				
Icebreakers.....	3	19, 203	3	19, 203
Frigates.....	28	11, 115	27	11, 113
Large minesweepers.....	34	72, 511	0	-----
Minesweepers.....	43	34, 152	0	-----
Large sub chasers.....	78	35, 088	0	-----
Small sub chasers.....	62	7, 418	0	-----
Torpedo boats.....	205	53, 807	0	-----
Landing craft:				
Infantry.....	30	12, 360	0	-----
Tank.....	17	2, 765	0	-----
Vehicle.....	2	21	0	-----
Support.....	2	34	0	-----
Mechanized.....	54	1, 700	0	-----
Floating repair ships.....	4	2, 504	0	-----
River tugs.....	15	19, 000	0	-----
Pontoon barges.....	6	719	0	-----
Motor launch.....	1	11	0	-----
Plane personnel boat.....	1	3	0	-----
Total.....	585	272, 411	30	30, 316
	Transferred	Value ¹	Returned	Value ¹
ARMY WATERCRAFT				
Tankers.....	9	5, 520	0	-----
Freight vessel.....	1	767	0	-----
Machine shop barges.....	2	412	0	-----
Crane barges.....	17	3, 057	0	-----
Total.....	29	9, 756	0	-----

¹ Lend-lease invoice value (\$000).

² 1 certified as lost.

³ Cost to the U. S. Government at point of transfer (\$000).

Treaties of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation

*Statement by Harold F. Linder,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs¹*

The treaties with Colombia, Greece, Israel, Ethiopia, and Denmark² which are now before you bring to nine the number of treaties of this general type which have been signed on behalf

¹ Statement made before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 9 and released to the press on the same date.

² The treaty with Colombia was signed at Washington on Apr. 26, 1951; with Greece, at Athens on Aug. 3; with Israel, at Washington on Aug. 23; with Ethiopia, at Addis Ababa on Sept. 7, and with Denmark, at Copenhagen on Oct. 1. The supplementary agreement with Italy was signed at Washington on Sept. 26, 1951; for text, see BULLETIN of Oct. 8, 1951, p. 568.

of the United States since the war. You will recall that the first two treaties of this series, those with China and Italy, were considered by the Committee in 1948 and those with Uruguay and Ireland 2 years later, and that these treaties were approved by the Senate. The treaty with Italy has now been supplemented by an agreement, also before you, designed to bring it abreast of developments reflected in the more recent ones.

While there are differences among these nine treaties, fundamentally they are alike. Those with Colombia, Denmark, and Israel follow closely the treaty with Uruguay, which in turn was a restated form of the one with Italy. The treaty with Greece is also based on the Uruguay model, but with changes in matters of form. The treaty with Ethiopia is a specially adapted version of the document negotiated with the other countries, involving considerable abridgment of the usual provisions and the addition of articles on diplomatic and consular officers no longer usual in this type of treaty. All these treaties also reflect differences of varying extent in matters of detail, both as a result of new or improved provisions which have been developed from time to time by the Department of State with counsel from other agencies and as a result of the adjustments that inevitably occur during the give and take of negotiation. For example, the basic establishment provisions have been extensively restated in the treaty with Israel, additional provisions on shipping are included in the Greek treaty, and a provision regarding the use of the term "coffee" has been added to the treaty with Colombia. But the general objectives remain the same and, with the departures that may be noted in the case of Ethiopia, all the treaties go about realizing these objectives in essentially the same way.

The more notable differences in the several instruments now before you, both as among themselves and as compared with those previously approved by the Senate, are summarized in the report of the Secretary of State attached in each case to the President's message of transmittal. I want to submit now, for the convenience of the Committee, copies of a tabular comparison which indicates in greater detail the similarities and differences of these instruments on a provision-by-provision basis.³ In my remarks I shall not attempt to repeat or elaborate on that information, leaving the discussion of details to be guided by such questions the Committee may have. To assist in providing specific information about particular provisions, I have with me officers of the Department who have been immediately responsible for the technical aspects of these documents.

The commercial treaty program is the oldest continuing economic program of our Government. It dates back to the beginnings of our national independence and has been kept up, with minor interruptions, ever since. As a rule the first treaty

³ Not printed here.

concluded with a foreign country has tended to be a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, which sets the framework in which our economic relations can be conducted on a stable basis for the future. The instrument aims at establishing the rule of law in our everyday relations with the country concerned, at protecting our citizens and their property in the foreign country, at promoting our trade, and at reducing discriminations against our shipping. An idea of the enduring character of these treaties may be gained from the fact that the treaty with Denmark now before you is to replace one negotiated with that country in 1826, and the treaty with Colombia will take the place of one signed in 1846.

While this is a traditional program with a history of over a century and a half, its modern phase dates from the years immediately after the First World War. At that time, a broadened and revitalized program devoted particularly to the expansion of our foreign trade was developed under the direction of Secretary Charles Evans Hughes. Negotiations were carried on extensively until the outbreak of World War II, resulting in the conclusion of treaties with 12 countries.

While the current program is a continuation of that instituted under Secretary Hughes, remaining similar in fundamentals to what has gone before, the present program reflects new emphasis occasioned by problems which have taken on increased importance in recent years. The consular provisions have been detached in the interest of more effective treatment of such subject matter. The form and content of the draft has been expanded and revamped, and the pace of negotiation has accelerated. In this connection it may be noted that in the first 6 years after the end of World War I three treaties were concluded. In the same length of time after World War II nine have been signed. Although the commitments contained in the current treaties tend to be more far-reaching, the general international climate is less sympathetic to the free enterprise premises on which these treaties are based. Moreover, as you well recognize, governments all over the world are constantly preoccupied with pressing and critical problems, which is not exactly an atmosphere conducive to negotiations of agreements of the type now before you.

Perhaps the most important respect in which the current documents differ from those of the 20's and 30's is in the greatly increased emphasis on the encouragement of American private investment abroad, by the expansion and strengthening of provisions relating to the protection of the investor and his interests. This development, of course, reflects the process of continuous adjustment to the needs and conditions of the era in which the negotiation takes place. The United States came out of the war with a greatly expanded industrial machine and, alone among the major nations of the world, with a surplus of private

capital available for export. To encourage the investment of this capital in the production of goods and services abroad was a matter of importance to our domestic economy and to economic development and world prosperity generally. Apart from these purely economic considerations, moreover, foreign investment can strengthen the common defense and promote the prevalence of ideas of individual liberty and individual initiative under law.

The basic aim of these new provisions has been to safeguard the investor against the nonbusiness hazards of foreign operations, an objective emphasized by the Congress in the Act for International Development of 1950. There is no intent here, of course, to shield the investor from the economic risks to which venture capital is subject, a matter which cannot and should not be reached through international agreement. However, there are grave hazards of a nonbusiness nature which have become characteristic in overseas business operations since the war. They assume many forms: inequitable tax statutes, confiscatory expropriation laws, rigid employment controls, special favors to state-owned businesses, drastic exchange restrictions, and other discriminations against foreign capital. Taken together, they can be a formidable obstacle to the American investor, for they impair from the very start the prospect of fair competition and a reasonable profit. Yet these hazards are not infrequently legal rather than economic, and they can be checked to a substantial extent by documents which establish mutually agreed standards of treatment for the citizens and enterprises of one country within the territories of the other.

Perhaps the most striking advance of the postwar treaties over earlier ones is the cognizance taken of the widespread use of the corporate form of business organization in present day economic affairs. In those antedating World War II, American corporations were specifically assured only small protection against possible discriminatory treatment in foreign countries. In the postwar treaties, however, corporations are accorded essentially the same rights as individuals in such vital matters as the right to do business, taxation on a nondiscriminatory basis, the acquisition and enjoyment of real and personal property, and the application of exchange controls. Furthermore, the citizens and corporations of one country are given substantial rights in connection with forming local subsidiaries under the corporation laws of the other country and controlling and managing the affairs of such local companies. The legal reason inhibiting a more extensive provision for corporations in earlier treaties (namely, the reserved rights of the States as to the admission of foreign corporations) has been solved in the current treaties by a formula which equates the alien corporation to other out-of-State corporations, rather than to the State's own corporations, for

purposes of "national treatment" in the United States.

Another significant feature of the postwar treaties of interest to the prospective investor is the body of provisions which deals with problems arising from the state ownership of economic enterprise. There is a growing tendency abroad for the real competitor of private business to be the government itself. The Department of State has, accordingly, endeavored to work out provisions designed to reduce the hazards of unfair competition from state-controlled businesses. These clauses provide most-favored-nation treatment in the conduct of state trading operations and in the awarding of government contracts and concessions. They also establish broadened rules governing the carrying out of nationalization programs. There are also newly developed provisions, found first in the 1948 treaty with Italy, to assure American private business concerns which must compete with foreign state-owned concerns the same economic favors that the latter received from their government, and to assure that state-owned commercial enterprises of the one country engaging in business in the other country will not be immune from taxation, suit, or other normal liabilities by reason of their public character.

Another important development in the post-World War II treaties is the provision on exchange controls. The formulation of such a provision poses difficulties. Many foreign countries have a genuine need to protect their limited foreign-exchange reserves in order to insure that the highest priority needs of their economy are met. At the same time, there is a real need for liberal provisions on withdrawals of earnings that will afford a proper protection to investors. We have sought to achieve a fair balance between the two factors.

In addition to the innovations introduced to better the climate for investment, substantial improvements have been introduced in provisions of longer standing. The rules on expropriation of property have been worked out in more detail; more explicit assurances have been formulated on basic personal freedoms and protection for the individual; and clauses have been added on freedom of communication and of reporting. Provisions on commercial arbitration and the employment of technical personnel have been added, and traditional provisions for nondiscriminatory treatment of shipping have been strengthened.

The continuing process of revamping of the standard provisions has benefited these treaties as a whole, both as to content and language. What we hope constantly to achieve is stronger articles, fewer exceptions, and above all, a document which can give the American citizen who goes abroad, whether for business, pleasure, livelihood, or study, a firm and clear body of rights and privileges.

So far I have spoken mainly about the rights these treaties assure and the protection they give to American citizens and businesses in foreign countries. However, these instruments are not one-sided. They are drawn up in mutual terms, in keeping with their character as freely negotiated instruments between friendly sovereign equals. Rights assured to Americans in foreign countries are assured in equivalent measure to foreigners in this country. In undertaking treaty commitments that would formally confirm to foreigners a substantial body of rights in the United States, the Department of State has exercised great care to frame provisions that would be in conformity with Federal law. The exception is that article VII of the supplementary agreement with Italy provides for the development of arrangements, not provided for by Federal statute, regarding totalization of social security benefits.

Furthermore, where the subject matter covers fields in which the States have a paramount interest, such as the formation and regulation of corporations and the ownership of property, the treaty provisions have been worked out with the same careful regard for the States' prerogatives and policies that has traditionally characterized agreements of this type.

These documents are concerned primarily with legal conditions and with the effect such conditions may have on economic activities carried on across international boundaries. Although they are comprehensive documents, they are not able to remove all legal impediments to investment, owing both to the inherent nature of such a treaty and the complexity of present-day economic affairs. While these treaties are concerned with everyday matters, they are not exclusively economic in nature or purpose; they are also, and perhaps above all, treaties of friendship. Their objectives are the normal objectives of friendship between nations; to protect the foreigner, to maintain good order in everyday affairs, to encourage mutually beneficial relations, and to strengthen the rule of law in the dealings of one nation with another. They are practical expressions of good faith and good neighborliness as much as they are legal contracts. Their worth rests as much on their equity and reasonableness as on the number and scope of the privileges they specify; and their spirit, which goes beyond the limits and wording of the treaties themselves, is in every way as important as the letter of the undertakings they actually make.

The Department of State for many reasons regards these treaties as an important element in promoting our national interests and building a stronger economy within the free world through the traditional American means of private enterprise, and it is most gratified that your Committee is finding time from a very crowded calendar to give them its study and attention.

Africa

- ETHIOPIA: Treaty of friendship, commerce,
and navigation 881

American Principles

- A strong defense to achieve peace (Truman) . . . 847
Foreign policy, some crossroads of (Russell) . . . 859

American Republics

- COLOMBIA: Treaty of friendship, commerce,
and navigation 881

Asia

- ISRAEL: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and
navigation 881

Disarmament Commission

- U.S. statement on cartel position of atomic
energy (Cohen) 872

Europe

- DENMARK: Treaty of friendship, commerce,
and navigation 881

GERMANY:

- West Germany on the threshold of sovereignty
(McCloy) 857
Germany: today and tomorrow, part II (Kel-
lermann) 851

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: May 19-24, 1952

Releases may be obtained from the Office of the Special Assistant for Press Relations, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. Items marked (*) are not printed in the BULLETIN; items marked (†) will appear in a future issue.

No.	Date	Subject
369	5/9	Linder: Commercial treaties
375	5/12	Reply to U.K. aide-memoire of Apr. 10
377	5/12	N. Atlantic ocean shipping board
*397	5/19	Sargeant: Charges in <i>Mercury</i> article
†398	5/19	U.S. treaty developments
*399	5/19	Anniversary of Norway
*400	5/20	Pt. 4 technicians complete course
*401	5/20	Anniversary of Cuba
402	5/20	14th sess. of Ecosoc council
403	5/21	Acheson: World trade week
404	5/21	Compton: Voa at water's edge
†405	5/21	Martin: Tca administrative officer
†406	5/22	Bruce: Immigration, House Comm.
*407	5/22	Visitors to U.S.
†408	5/23	Auerbach: New immigrants
†409	5/23	Linder: Trade expansion
410	5/23	Russell: Foreign policy crossroads
†411	5/24	Fulbright opportunities, 1953
†412	5/24	Department passport policy

- GREECE: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and
navigation 881
U.S.S.R.: Status of lend-lease negotiations with,
text of letters (McFall, Knowland) 879

International Information

- Voice of America at the water's edge (Compton) . . . 864

International Meetings

- Calendar of meetings 868
The International Mathematical Union and Its
Work (Stone) 870

U.S. DELEGATIONS:

- Economic and Social Council, 14th Session . . . 875
North Atlantic Planning Board for Ocean
Shipping, Naro, 4th Session 876

Mutual Aid and Defense

- A strong defense to achieve peace (Truman) . . . 847

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

- North Atlantic Planning Board for Ocean Ship-
ping, 4th Session 876

Presidential Documents

- PROCLAMATIONS: Funds for U.S. participa-
tion in Olympics urged 850

State, Department of

- Foreign policy, some crossroads of (Russell) . . . 859

Trade

- U.S. policy on trade restrictions, text of note . . . 858
World trade week, significance of (Acheson) . . . 863

Treaty Information

- Treaties of friendship, commerce, and naviga-
tion, statement (Linder) 881

United Nations

- Economic and Social Council, 14th Session,
U.S. delegation 875
U.N. Bibliography: selected documents 876
U.S. in the U.N. 877

Name Index

- Acheson, Secretary 863
Cohen, Benjamin V. 872
Compton, Wilson 864
Kellermann, Henry J. 851
Knowland, William F. 879
Linder, Harold F. 881
Lubin, Isador 875
Mann, John W. 876
McCloy, John J. 857
McFall, Jack K. 880
Morse, Huntington T. 876
Russell, Francis H. 859
Stone, M. H. 870
Truman, President 847, 850